

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

VOL. XIX. No. 26
WHOLE No. 494

OCTOBER 5, 1918

{ PRICE, 10 CENTS
{\$3.00 A YEAR

Chronicle

The War.—For the Allies the week was one of the most successful of the war. In prisoners alone it netted for them more than 100,000. At the northern tip of the western front, Belgian and British *Bulletin*, Sept. 23, troops attacked from Dixmude to the p.m. Sept. 30, a.m. north of Ypres, making an advance of over three and a half miles. On September 28, the new Allied line ran through Woumen, Pierkenshoek, Schaep, Baillie and Broodeseynde. Two days later Dixmude, Zarten, Stademberg, Passchendaele, Moorsiede and part of Westroosebeke were taken, and the Allies had advanced to within two miles of the German base at Roulers. Attacking on a wide front the British First and Third armies, respectively, under the command of Generals Horne and Byng, aided by Americans, tightened their hold upon Cambrai. On the extreme right the Americans captured fortified outposts of the Hindenburg system south of Le Catelet. The main thrust was upon a front of about fourteen miles against strong enemy positions, particularly in the sector of the Canal du Nord. On the north of the main attack the British captured Beaucamp and the ridge running to Marcoing, and Sauchy-Lestrees and Sauchy-Cauchy, south of the Sensée and Scarpe Rivers. On the right center the British, under General Haldane, broke through the German lines east of Havrincourt, took Flesquieres and stormed the ridge running eastward to Marcoing. The line of the Canal du Nord east and southeast of Moeuvres was also stormed and Anneux captured. Fontaine Notre Dame was also taken, thus bringing the British within three miles of Cambrai. The following day, September 28, further progress was made, particularly on the east and southwest. At Sailly the British were only two miles distant from the town. The next day the British advanced to the gates of Cambrai; the Americans supporting them took Bellecourt and Nauroy, south of Le Catelet.

Around St. Quentin, and on the Oise front north of La Fère, the French mastered the west bank of the Oise for more than half the distance from La Fère to Moy. On the Chemin des Dames General Mangin advanced his lines two miles. General Debeney's troops reached the Oise through Vendeuil, which had been evacuated by the enemy. As the French drew near the Hindenburg line around St. Quentin the enemy made determined

efforts to hold them back. North of the Somme the Germans are reported to have organized a defensive system on the heights running parallel to a portion of the old Hindenburg line.

A heavy blow was struck by a combined French and American force on a comparatively quiet sector. The attack extended from the Meuse north of Verdun beyond the Argonne Forest into Champagne as far as Aubervillers on the Suisse River. This territory was probably chosen because the enemy here lacks good supply lines. The brunt of the attack was delivered east of the Argonne between the Aire and the Meuse, where for thirty miles northward, as far as Sedan, the Germans have behind them no natural defensive obstacle. West of the Aisne, where the French were operating under Gouraud, the average depth of the advance was three miles; east of the river the furthest point reached on the first day's attack by General Hunter Liggett's American divisions was Dannevoux, close to the Meuse. The following day the Americans made a further gain of three miles, striking the Kriemhilde Line at Brieulles and then reaching Exermont and Romagne. West of the Argonne the French reached Somme-Py then Bellevue Heights, Manre and Bussy Farm.

Both from a military and political point of view the Allied victories on the Macedonian front were surprising. These started with the Allied attacks upon the Bulgarian front between the Cerna and Vardar Rivers, chronicled last

The Balkan Front week, which were followed by the disordered withdrawal of the Bulgarians. On the left or western extremity of the line the Italians on September 23 advanced on the Bulgarian base at Prilep, north of Monastir, and separated the First Bulgarian army from the Second army in the Doiran section. In the center, Serbian, French and Greek forces crossed the Drensko mountain range and cut the railroad from Prilep to Gradska at its junction with the main line from Saloniki to Uskub. Under pressure of Greek and British forces operating in the Lake Doiran district, the enemy evacuated the line from Doiran to the Vardar.

The following day, September 24, French cavalry, supported by the Serbians, captured Prilep; the British took Doiran and swept north past Kara Oghular. At the

same time the Serbians reached the eastern bank of the Vardar between Demirkapu Pass and Krivolak, while their cavalry reached the plains of Lipa and Kaliyan. North of Monastir the Italians captured the strategic heights of Liobishte, while Greek and French troops operating on the British left took Gurinchet, a few miles west of the Vardar. The broken Bulgarian army was soon in full retreat on a front of 130 miles, heading for Veles, east of the Vardar. The Serbians crossed the Vardar east of Gradsko, advanced along the Bregalnitz River, four miles northeast of Gradsko, and cut the main road from Krivolak to Ishtib. Ishtib surrendered, and by September 26 Vales, twenty-five miles southeast of Uskub, the main railroad center of old Serbia, was captured by the Serbians, while British and Greek troops invaded Bulgaria from the Doiran region and crossed the Belachist range, and British detachments crossed the border opposite Kusturino, about six miles from the fortress of Strumnitz. The Bulgarian Premier, Mr. Malinoff, at this juncture asked the Allied commander for an armistice. The latter refused, but stated that he was willing to receive accredited Bulgarian peace envoys. The Bulgarian request was forwarded to the Allied Governments. As far as can be now ascertained the terms seem to be "unconditional surrender." It was reported that Bulgarian peace delegates had reached Saloniki; that Chancellor Count von Hertling had resigned, and that while the Allied armies were sweeping forward in Macedonia on a 225-mile front from Lake Ochrida to a point within the Bulgarian border, the Germans had begun a withdrawal from Rumania.

In Palestine General Allenby's victory is now considered to be one of the most complete gained by the Allies during the war. His capture of Haifa and Acre on the coast, his encircling of the Turkish army north of Nazareth and his possession of the Jordan near the Lake of Genesareth, together with the fords east of the river, enabled him to destroy practically the entire Turkish army. At least 45,000 Turks were captured, and the remaining divisions are so disorganized that as a military force the Turkish army in Palestine may be said not to exist.

In his New York speech of September 27, the President rejected the recent peace offers put forth by Germany and her Allies. After a brief reference to the

*The President and the
Peace Offensive* Fourth Liberty Loan Drive, and a statement to the effect that our purposes in the war were perhaps not clear at the outset but they are clear now, Mr. Wilson thus splendidly outlined our aims and our program:

The war has lasted more than four years and the whole world has been drawn into it. The common will of mankind has been substituted for the particular purposes of individual States. Individual statesmen may have started the conflict, but neither they nor their opponents can stop it as they please. It has become a people's war, and peoples of all sorts and races, of every degree of power and variety of fortune, are involved in its sweeping processes of change and settlement. We came into

it when its character had become fully defined and it was plain that no nation could stand apart or be indifferent to its outcome. Its challenge drove to the heart of everything we cared for and lived for. The voice of the war had become clear and gripped our hearts. Our brothers from many lands, as well as our own murdered dead under the sea, were calling to us, and we responded, fiercely and of course.

The air was clear about us. We saw things in their full, convincing proportions as they were; and we have seen them with steady eyes*and unchanging comprehension ever since. We accepted the issues of the war as facts, not as any group of men either here or elsewhere had defined them, and we can accept no outcome which does not squarely meet and settle them. Those issues are these:

Shall the military power of any nation or group of nations be suffered to determine the fortunes of peoples over whom they have no right to rule except the right of force? Shall strong nations be free to wrong weak nations and make them subject to their purpose and interest? Shall peoples be ruled and dominated, even in their own internal affairs, by arbitrary and irresponsible force or by their own will and choice? Shall there be a common standard of right and privilege for all peoples and nations or shall the strong do as they will and the weak suffer without redress? Shall the assertion of right be haphazard and by casual alliance or shall there be a common concert to oblige the observance of common rights?

No man, no group of men, chose these to be the issues of the struggle. They are the issues of it; and they must be settled—by no arrangement or compromise or adjustment of interests, but definitely and once for all and with a full and unequivocal acceptance of the principle that the interest of the weakest is as sacred as the interest of the strongest.

This is what we mean when we speak of a permanent peace, if we speak sincerely, intelligently, and with a real knowledge and comprehension of the matter we deal with.

We are all agreed that there can be no peace obtained by any kind of bargain or compromise with the Governments of the Central Empires, because we have dealt with them already and have seen them deal with other Governments that were parties to this struggle, at Brest-Litovsk and Bucharest. They have convinced us that they are without honor and do not intend justice. They observe no covenants, accept no principle but force and their own interest. We cannot "come to terms" with them. They have made it impossible. The German people must by this time be fully aware that we cannot accept the word of those who forced this war upon us. We do not think the same thoughts or speak the same language of agreement.

It is of capital importance that we should also be explicitly agreed that no peace shall be obtained by any kind of compromise or abatement of the principles we have avowed as the principles for which we are fighting. There should exist no doubt about that. I am, therefore, going to take the liberty of speaking with the utmost frankness about the practical implications that are involved in it.

If it be indeed and in truth the common object of the Governments associated against Germany and of the nations whom they govern, as I believe it to be, to achieve by the coming settlements a secure and lasting peace, it will be necessary that all who sit down at the peace table shall come ready and willing to pay the price, the only price, that will procure it; and ready and willing, also, to create in some virile fashion the only instrumentality by which it can be made certain that the agreements of the peace will be honored and fulfilled.

That price is impartial justice in every item of the settlement, no matter whose interest is crossed; and not only impartial justice, but also the satisfaction of the several peoples whose fortunes are dealt with. That indispensable instrumentality is a league of nations formed under covenants that will be efficacious.

Without such an instrumentality, by which the peace of the world can be guaranteed, peace will rest in part upon the word of outlaws, and only upon that word. For Germany will have to redeem her character, not by what happens at the peace table but by what follows.

And, as I see it, the constitution of that league of nations and the clear definition of its objects must be a part, is in a sense the most essential part, of the peace settlement itself. It cannot be formed now. If formed now, it would be merely a new alliance confined to the nations associated against a common enemy. It is not likely that it could be formed after the settlement. It is necessary to guarantee the peace; and the peace cannot be guaranteed as an afterthought. The reason, to speak in plain terms again, why it must be guaranteed is that there will be parties to the peace whose promises have proved untrustworthy, and means must be found in connection with the peace settlement itself to remove that source of insecurity. It would be folly to leave the guarantee to the subsequent voluntary action of the Governments we have seen destroy Russia and deceive Rumania.

But these general terms do not disclose the whole matter. Some details are needed to make them sound less like a thesis and more like a practical program. These, then, are some of the particulars, and I state them with the greater confidence because I can state them authoritatively as representing this Government's interpretation of its own duty with regard to peace.

First, the impartial justice meted out must involve no discrimination between those to whom we wish to be just and those to whom we do not wish to be just. It must be a justice that plays no favorites and knows no standard but the equal rights of the several peoples concerned.

Second, no special or separate interest of any single nation or any group of nations can be made the basis of any part of the settlement which is not consistent with the common interest of all.

Third, there can be no leagues or alliances or special covenants and understandings within the general and common family of the league of nations.

Fourth, and more specifically, there can be no special, selfish economic combinations within the league and no employment of any form of economic boycott or exclusion except as the power of economic penalty by exclusion from the markets of the world may be vested in the league of nations itself as a means of discipline and control.

Fifth, all international agreements and treaties of every kind must be made known in their entirety to the rest of the world.

Special alliances and economic rivalries and hostilities have been the prolific source in the modern world of the plans and passions that produce war. It would be an insincere as well as an insecure peace that did not exclude them in definite and binding terms.

The confidence with which I venture to speak for our people in these matters does not spring from our traditions merely and the well-known principles of international action which we have always professed and followed. In the same sentence in which I say that the United States will enter into no special arrangements or understandings with particular nations let me say also that the United States is prepared to assume its full share of responsibility for the maintenance of the common covenants and understandings upon which peace must henceforth rest. We still read Washington's immortal warning against "entangling alliances" with full comprehension and an answering purpose. But only special and limited alliances entangle; and we recognize and accept the duty of a new day in which we are permitted to hope for a general alliance which will avoid entanglements and clear the air of the world for common understandings and the maintenance of common rights.

I have made this analysis of the international situation which

the war has created, not, of course, because I doubted whether the leaders of the great nations and peoples with whom we are associated were of the same mind and entertained a like purpose, but because the air every now and again gets darkened by mists and groundless doubtings and mischievous perversions of counsel and it is necessary once and again to sweep all the irresponsible talk about peace intrigues and weakening morale and doubtful purpose on the part of those in authority utterly, and if need be unceremoniously, aside and say things in the plainest words that can be found, even when it is only to say over again what has been said before, quite as plainly if in less unvarnished terms.

As I have said, neither I nor any other man in governmental authority created or gave form to the issues of this war. I have simply responded to them with such vision as I could command. But I have responded gladly and with a resolution that has grown warmer and more confident as the issues have grown clearer and clearer. It is now plain that they are issues which no man can pervert unless it be wilfully. I am bound to fight for them, and happy to fight for them as time and circumstance have revealed them to me as to all the world. Our enthusiasm for them grows more and more irresistible as they stand out in more and more vivid and unmistakable outline.

And the forces that fight for them draw into closer and closer array, organize their millions into more and more unconquerable might, as they become more and more distinct to the thought and purpose of the peoples engaged. It is the peculiarity of this great war that while statesmen have seemed to cast about for definitions of their purpose and have sometimes seemed to shift their ground and their point of view, the thought of the mass of men, whom statesmen are supposed to instruct and lead, has grown more and more unclouded, more and more certain of what it is that they are fighting for. National purposes have fallen more and more into the background and the common purpose of enlightened mankind has taken their place. The counsels of plain men have become on all hands more simple and straightforward and more unified than the counsels of sophisticated men of affairs, who still retain the impression that they are playing a game of power and playing for high stakes. That is why I have said that this is a peoples' war, not a statesmen's. Statesmen must follow the clarified common thought or be broken.

I take that to be the significance of the fact that assemblies and associations of many kinds made up of plain workaday people have demanded, almost every time they came together, and are still demanding, that the leaders of their Governments declare to them plainly what it is, exactly what it is, that they are seeking in this war, and what they think the items of the final settlement should be. They are not yet satisfied with what they have been told. They still seem to fear that they are getting what they ask for only in statesmen's terms,—only in the terms of territorial arrangements and divisions of power, and not in terms of broad-visioned justice and mercy and peace and the satisfaction of those deep-seated longings of oppressed and distrusted men and women and enslaved peoples that seem to them the only things worth fighting a war for that engulfs the world. Perhaps statesmen have not always recognized this changed aspect of the whole world of policy and action. Perhaps they have not always spoken in direct reply to the questions asked because they did not know how searching those questions were and what sort of answers they demanded.

But I, for one, am glad to attempt the answer again and again, in the hope that I may make it clearer and clearer that my one thought is to satisfy those who struggle in the ranks and are, perhaps above all others, entitled to a reply whose meaning no one can have any excuse for misunderstanding, if he understands the language in which it is spoken or can get someone to translate it correctly into his own. And I believe that

the leaders of the Governments with which we are associated will speak, as they have occasion, as plainly as I have tried to speak. I hope that they will feel free to say whether they think that I am in any degree mistaken in my interpretation of the issues involved or in my purpose with regard to the means by which a satisfactory settlement of those issues may be obtained. Unity of purpose and of counsel are as imperatively necessary in this war as was unity of command in the battlefield; and with perfect unity of purpose and counsel will come assurance of complete victory. It can be had in no other way. "Peace drives" can be effectively neutralized and silenced only by showing that every victory of the nations associated against Germany brings the nations nearer the sort of peace which will bring security and reassurance to all peoples and make the recurrence of another such struggle of pitiless force and bloodshed forever impossible, and that nothing else can. Germany is constantly intimating the "terms" she will accept; and always finds that the world does not want terms. It wishes the final triumph of justice and fair dealing.

The President's address thrilled the vast audience. On every side it has been considered one of his finest utterances, noble in its conception, and splendid in the vision which it raises.

France.—In an issue of *La Croix*, M. Jean Guiraud points out two new dangers to liberty of education in France. The first danger is found in the fact that the

Government has published a circular *Liberty of Education* addressed to all the *prefets* of France,

in which they are directed to make an investigation with a view to discovering what free schools, as distinguished from public schools, can be turned into military hospitals for the wounded soldiers of the Allies. M. Guiraud declares that Catholics are willing to give up their schools for this purpose; in fact, they have done so in many instances, since the beginning of the war; but he calls on the Government not to retain such schools unless it is absolutely necessary. He insists also that the burden of furnishing buildings for hospital purposes should fall with equal, or even greater, heaviness on Governmental institutions, since they are the property of the nation. He says very clearly:

To act otherwise would be to pursue the war on free education, by depriving it, of set purpose, of every means of carrying it on, and hypocritically to sow civil discord under the fallacious pretext of the *union sacrée* and national defense. We ask the Government, therefore, to give over to free education those schools of which there is not absolute need, and not to take over others, without making similar requisitions, in a true spirit of justice and impartiality, on the side of public education.

The other danger is scarcely less grave. "The enemies of the free schools," continues the editor of *La Croix*, "have another means of interfering with their continuance under the pretext of national defense." Of late years the French have been accustomed to send their children to the schools and colleges under the direction of religious, which, since the expulsion of the religious from France, have been established outside of France, for instance, in Spain and Switzerland. The beneficial influence of these educational establishments has been recognized officially by the Government.

But the continuance of these schools and colleges is menaced by measures which are stupid in their brutality. All the children who attend them, even those of only ten or twelve years, are required to have passports in order to pass the frontier, and these passports are granted under such arbitrary conditions that, oftener than not, both families and children find it impossible to procure them.

La Croix admits the necessity of taking precautions, but protests against the policy of depriving these exiled teachers of any chance of receiving scholars and the children's parents of their right of free choice in the matter of education.

Ireland.—On September 25 the Irish Parliamentary Party met in Dublin and adopted these resolutions, which were supported by all the members, except Captain Gwynn, who refused adherence to the

The Irish Party and views concerning conscription:
Conscription

That the continued threat of conscription, combined with the policy of coercion carried out by wholesale arrests, seizures, suppression by imprisonment, deportation without definite charges or trials, and by outrageous sentences inflicted by court martial for nominal or trivial offenses, has created a feeling of profound indignation throughout the length and breadth of Ireland, and has evoked the strongest indignation among all sections of the people;

That such a policy, if persisted in, can serve no other end than to strengthen and intensify the existing resentment against misgovernment, coercion and military rule in this country;

That we protest in the strongest possible manner against the continuance of this policy, as the very negation of liberty and of all those principles of freedom and right for which the Allied nations profess to be in arms;

That we, therefore, call upon the Government forthwith to abandon both conscription and coercion in Ireland, and warn them that persistence in their present policy is fraught with most far-reaching and dangerous consequences, both to Ireland and the Allied cause;

That we still adhere to the position we took up at the beginning of the war, that the principles for which the Allies are fighting are those of liberty and justice, but we recognize that the policy of the British Government since the war began has completely shaken the confidence of our people that those principles are to be given effect in Ireland, and in our opinion the only effective method of restoring that confidence is to apply those principles to Ireland without delay when, we are convinced, there will be ready and voluntary response from the people to the cause of the Allies.

A short time after this statement was made public the New York Clan-na-Gael petitioned President Wilson to "demand of England the immediate concession of Ireland's righteous claim for freedom." The resolution was premised by the statement that 1,500,000 men of Irish blood were in arms against Germany.

The Dublin *Leader*, commenting upon existing conditions declares "England's policy in Ireland is rushing down a *cul de sac* and she will have to turn back sooner or later." The paper goes on to say that if a general election is declared, Irish constituencies will return the Irishmen held in British jails without definite charge and without trial. Then, says the editor, "Lloyd George will have to eat not only the leek, but the German plot."

John Ireland, Archbishop and Patriot

RICHARD H. TIERNEY, S.J.

JOHN IRELAND is dead: the zealous Archbishop and great patriot lies among lowly people in a humble grave in Calvary, on the outskirts of St. Paul. A heart that pulsed with a thousand vital interests is stilled forever, and the country is mourning a noble man who for more than half a century upheld the priestly dignity and the honor of American citizenship with unmatched power. Soldier, patriot, Bishop and Archbishop, the "Lion of the Northwest" was distinguished in each sphere. A fearless, godly man, keen of intellect, strong of will, a relentless yet chivalrous opponent, he left an indelible impression on all he touched, for Archbishop Ireland was a great man among the greatest men. When shall we see his like again?

Years ago, in 1861, long before many of the captains of the present generation were born, he was set down in a northwestern wilderness, a young and inexperienced priest, among hardy pioneers little accustomed to the luxuries of life or the refinements of metropolitan society. He was to make his way, a priest's difficult and anxious way, amongst a new people. He did it well, as only he could do it. Hardly were the sacred oils dry on his consecrated hands before he became a hero. The roar of cannon and the blare of trumpet had been hurried to St. Paul on a wind that blew northward from southern battlefields. The Union was endangered and strong men were needed to preserve it. John Ireland stepped into the ranks, and for a fateful year, until he was prostrated by fever, he distinguished himself by service in the field and hospital, a ministering angel to the sturdy soldiers of the famous Fifth Minnesota Regiment.

Home once again, he took up his priestly duties in St. Paul and after a lapse of ten years was consecrated auxiliary Bishop, at that place. This was his opportunity and he did not miss it. In the larger sphere that is a bishop's, he exerted his great powers of mind and heart with such good effect that on May 15, 1888, he was named Archbishop of St. Paul. The choice was a happy one, both for the Northwest and the country at large. For he was a man of so far a vision and so high an ambition that he was not content to wrestle with the problems that lay under his hand. His eye swept the country and saw its needs, wants that he felt he could in a measure meet, and strong with the strength of honest conviction and high resolve, he went down into the arena and stayed there, giving and taking the blows of a warrior until at last he heard the rustle of the dark reaper's wings and retreated from the fray to meet with courage and peace the foe which no man, however brave, can conquer, death. And all the while that he struggled with great national problems, were they prin-

ciples or men, he was marvelously faithful to his work at home.

From a rather insignificant diocese with few churches and a scattered flock, St. Paul grew into a great archdiocese. Suffragan bishop was added to suffragan bishop, schools and colleges were opened in sufficient numbers to supply growing needs, a great seminary was inaugurated for candidates to the priesthood, Minneapolis was given a splendid pro-cathedral, and the lofty hill of St. Paul was crowned by a majestic basilica worthy of the genius of the Archbishop and the generosity of his devoted people.

Mgr. Ireland has done well by his beloved Northwest, but no less well by the United States. It was characteristic of the man that he would not, and perhaps could not, allow his plans to be carried into effect in St. Paul only. It was this disposition of soul that first brought him into permanent fame amongst his countrymen. History or legend has it that one night, in 1889, three drunken men staggered into his house and thrust into his hand a scrap of paper on which was written: "For God's sake, found a temperance society." The story is at least well invented; at any rate, a total abstinence, not a temperance society, was founded, and the Archbishop went up and down the country teaching by word and example the great worth of voluntary total abstinence, a Catholic practice sharply delimited from un-Catholic Prohibition which is founded on a false philosophy abhorrent to Catholic instincts, doctrines and customs.

All this time the Catholic population of the United States was growing by leaps and bounds, both by reason of a high birth-rate and immigration which Archbishop Ireland helped to promote by bringing colonists to this country. As a consequence of this rapid expansion, the energy of bishops and priests was exhausted in building churches and schools. But Catholic life does not entirely consist of churches and schools. These are but means to an end: there are other things just as important: national policies, for instance, and co-ordination of effort for the salvation of souls. Such had been sadly neglected; men were too busy to think of difficulties other than those at their doors. Not so Archbishop Ireland; he saw a thousand strings swaying in a thousand different breezes in a thousand different parts of this great country, and with one or two equally acute friends he resolved that those strings should be knit together to serve a definite far-reaching purpose. The results of this determination were Catholic congresses at Baltimore, in 1889, and at Chicago, in 1893. The history of these noted assemblies is too well known to bear repetition. One remark, however, is not out of place. Much of the fruit they bore can now be laid at

the feet of the dead prelate of St. Paul, in tribute of his greatness.

There are other testimonials, too, that would lend dignity to his bier, already dignified by the form of a masterful man. For it is a singular honor to have had a guiding hand in the foundation of the Catholic University, and in that splendid achievement John Ireland's hand was firm and sure. It is a tribute to learning, eloquence and patriotism to have been chosen by the United States Government to go to France to represent this country at the unveiling of the Joan of Arc statue. Archbishop Ireland was given that privilege, and that he did well by his native land is attested by even the bitter anti-clerical press, which paid him the best compliment it knew, that he was like unto the great orators of the Revolution. But these were small events in his career; the minor notes, perchance the thin undertones in his song of triumph. Compare such successes with those of the crowded years of 1889 to 1895, when, in a mighty exuberance of zeal, he labored so tactfully and fruitfully with the beloved Cardinal of Baltimore, in the interests of oppressed and restless labor. This was a prolonged and important effort, but there were other efforts less lengthy, perhaps, but no less important. There was Cahenslyism, in the eyes of some thoughtful men a base, if subtle, form of German propaganda which was making even religion an instrument for the extension of Prussianism; in the view of others, an odious scheme that at best would work out in irreparable dissensions. A group of factious men without due warrant from heaven or earth, tried to set up Bishops in the United States, for people speaking foreign tongues, principally German. Time has shown all that the plan was mischievous, but Archbishop Ireland did not wait on time. Forthwith he scented danger and threw all his energy into opposition. He came off victorious, thereby saving the sterling Americanism of the Church and at the same time vindicating the intelligence and zeal of our Bishops, who in his own words "are fully able to ward off any foreign invasion in the Church and to maintain it on thoroughly American lines."

Our country is not a Poland, to be partitioned at the good pleasure of foreigners. We have, under Peter's successor, our autonomy, and for the sake of the American Church and the American Republic we will retain autonomy.

Cahenslyism died an ignominious death and happily there has been no resurrection. Meantime, Irish, Germans, Poles and Italians have become good Americans and have kept the Faith to boot.

Archbishop Ireland was now at the height of his power and fame. And, truth to tell, he needed a deal of both to carry him through the great school controversy which began in 1891. It was a heroic battle, in which hard blows were freely given. All well-read men know its origin, progress and end, the last a complete, if slow, vindication of a fundamental Catholic principle, a Catholic education for Catholic children.

Whatever men thought of Mgr. Ireland's original attitude in this controversy, there is no one who now doubts his sincerity or deprecates his later pronouncements. In June, 1915, the national convention of the Catholic Educational Association of America was held in St. Paul, and Archbishop Ireland was listed to give the opening discourse. Some of those present that day had been too young to appreciate the drift of the controversy of 1891, but they had heard of it, and now that years and education had added to their maturity, they were keen to watch every word of the prelate, in order that no phase of his ethics might elude their intellects.

He came into the sanctuary, a man of heroic stature, magnificent in purple robes, and with unborrowed and unartificial dignity ascended the pulpit, stood silent for an instant and then made the great cathedral ring with Matthew xxvii: 19, 20. Another pause, and the basilica resounded with these memorable words:

I tell, in His words, the injunction of the Saviour to His Church, even to the consummation of the world. I tell the reason of the proclamation which today is that of the Catholic Church in the United States of America: Catholic schools for Catholic children.

What more was needed? Here was the prelate's true self pleading for the right upbringing of his children. Yet more was given. From period to period flowed the eloquent discourse, a complete and accurate statement of Catholic ethics and theology on the subject of education. And it was a sincere pronouncement: the words fell burning from the speaker's lips. Now he stood erect, hands aloft, and thundered his fine periods; again he bent swift and low in the pulpit, almost as an eagle swoops, and pleaded that Christ's children be brought up in Christ and for Christ, through schools Catholic in all ways. His mind was made clear beyond peradventure of misunderstanding or misinterpretation. By the natural law, the right and obligation of educating children pertains to their parents, not to the State, whose function, save under exceptional circumstances, is limited to the assistance necessary for the proper accomplishment of the parental duty. Such the trend of thought in that sermon of June 19, 1915, and no one was found to carp at it. The controversy of 1891 had sifted thought, and sound doctrine remained. The same too can be said of Americanism which was magnified out of all proportion to its importance by a clamor raised in France.

And now all is peace again and John Ireland is dead, and his death is a national calamity. Maybe this peace is also, for those conditions are morbid in which men are unwilling to strike hard for principles. Such was not the disposition of the "Lion of the Northwest." Militant for the Church he was equally militant for the State. Throughout his long and busy life he identified himself with all worthy civic movements and gave of his means and his strength in their support.

As late as 1908 when pacifists were numerous, blatant and popular, he appeared before the House Committee

on Military Affairs and pleaded for preparedness in these words:

I believe and I have always believed, that the best way to have peace is to be ready for war. A good deal is said nowadays, perhaps too much, against the army and against the spirit of war. The idea of universal peace is very good, but to make it a gospel is a mistake.

And in May, last year, he bade this farewell to the soldiers of Minnesota:

We congratulate you. It is a privilege that which is now given you to be the soldiers of America, to suffer to defend its flag, to carry it far and wide without stain or reproach to it, to make any sacrifice for it.

Next to God is country, and next to loyalty to God is loyalty to country. The man should not live who does not love and cherish his country. To speak of America is to speak of the greatest nation among nations; to defend America is to defend not only the nation that protects you, that nurtures you, but the nation that stands in the universe for the highest ideals, the noblest principles governing mankind.

Splendid words, but then none other could be expected from Archbishop Ireland, who on August 11, 1913, had said:

My civil and political faith is that of the republic of the United States of America. Americanism purest and brightest,

yielding in strength and loyalty to the Americanism of no other American, surpassed in spirit of obedience and sacrifice by that of none other citizen, none other soldier, sworn to uphold in peace and in war America's Star Spangled Banner.

Here was a man indeed. But, alas, the final taps have sounded for the soldier-prelate: he is at rest, not in the lofty cathedral that tops St. Anthony's hill, but in a poor grave, in humble Calvary, among those whom death has caught up from the hard and obscure ways of life. "Let me lie out there with my people under the green sod of Calvary. It is my wish," and his wish was respected. For a while, summer suns and winter rains will beat upon that little mound, and soon nothing mortal will be left of John Ireland, Archbishop and patriot. But yet he will live, for young men less exalted than he have caught his spirit of strong Christian knighthood, and they will transmit that spirit to others, even to him, let us hope, who will see the last ship of Tarsus and hear the sound of the last shuttle in the far Northwest which Archbishop Ireland magnified and glorified by his life and labors, in preparation for the day when the light of God's face would begin to shine on his brow forever and the music of the golden harps to resound in his soul for eternity.

The Basis for a Catholic Daily Paper

MICHAEL WILLIAMS

AMONG the many letters which I have received since AMERICA began printing my articles on Catholic publicity there was one of such importance as to demand a special consideration. Its writer is Mr. Louis Fusz, a veteran member of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, who has himself thought so earnestly on the subject of Catholic journalism, and so fruitfully that he set himself to the writing and publication of a pamphlet entitled, "A Plan for a Catholic Daily Press." A copy of this pamphlet is before me as I write, together with Mr. Fusz's letter, in which he says:

In the June 8 number (of AMERICA) you urge the creation of a central bureau to gather news of Catholic interest or correct misstatements and offer same to the secular daily press for publication, a movement to be desired; but in my opinion we need a Catholic daily press to create or maintain a Catholic atmosphere among our people and the general public.

Now, in giving Mr. Fusz's contribution to our subject that special consideration which I say it deserves, there are three points which offer shining opportunities for discussion. The first point is, that Mr. Fusz, a practical business man, a veteran worker in practical Catholic social work, belongs to that large and constantly growing body of thinkers who maintain the thesis that the creation of a Catholic daily press in the English language is the paramount issue of Catholic social action in the United States. The second point is, that he offers suggestions for a plan of operation to obtain a Catholic daily press. The third point is that, though Mr. Fusz approves of a publicity

bureau, he places the need for a Catholic daily press above the need for the publicity bureau; yet at the same time, in his own plan for organizing the daily press he makes the creation of a central bureau for *news gathering and distribution* an essential part of his plan.

The importance of the first of these points speaks for itself. It means that sooner or later we are going to have Catholic daily newspapers. Since there is a large and, as I believe, constantly growing number of thoughtful Catholic men and women who believe in the need for a Catholic daily press, who are thinking out ways and means for establishing it, praying for it, and offering their Holy Communions for it, it follows, I hold, that a Catholic daily press we shall have. Faith is a creative force, for good and for evil. A mere handful of men and women belonging to a small and wildly heretical sect "held the thought," as their own vernacular would put the case, of a great, national, nay, even an international, daily newspaper which should forcefully and skilfully express and disseminate their heresy, and they quickly and efficiently "demonstrated," as they themselves would say. Result, the *Christian Science Monitor*, plus a Christian Science news bureau and publicity service, stretching from Boston to San Francisco, and beyond the seas into other lands. Well, we have been slow, but most assuredly we have faith—aye, praised be the goodness of God, we have the Faith: the Faith of everlasting and invincible Truth: the Faith and the Truth that shall continue and triumph in the face of no matter what

efficient and businesslike and smartly organized sects and heresies and all the mighty powers of the new paganism. Sooner or later there is bound to be a manifestation of our faith in that form which the time and the conditions in our own loved country so clearly call for, the Catholic daily press.

As to the second point of Mr. Fusz's letter which I have marked for discussion, his plan for realizing his faith, space forbids me to explain it here in detail. In substance, however, he proposes the formation of a national religious society headed by our Bishops, composed of parish branches in every diocese. There would be two classes of members. The first, general class would be composed of men and women who would pledge themselves to subscribe for the nearest daily paper published by the society; to give some at least of their advertising to it, when they happened to be advertisers; to patronize those who did advertise in the Catholic paper; to report interesting news to such papers. Members of the society living in country districts outside the reach of the daily papers would similarly support their diocesan weeklies, these being also published by the national society. The second class of members would be those who would combine to form a corporation chartered to do a general publishing business, capitalized at a figure judged by these incorporators to be adequate; the shares to be of small denomination, so as to be within the means of large numbers; the controlling interest in the stock to be a voting trust in the hands of the proper ecclesiastical authorities, in order to insure the permanency of the purpose of the society.

Concerning this plan as a whole, I should say that it appears to me to be something like the organization which might *eventually* be evolved as the result of the successful operation of individual daily papers springing up here and there and gradually combining their forces and perfecting a system for the chain publication of a larger number of papers. In other words, I do not believe that we could successfully launch a great national organization composed of parish branches. There is too much indifference; there is too sluggish and too stodgy a mass of widespread ignorance of our duty; all of which must *first* be leavened and then done away with by campaigns of education.

Moreover—and now I reach my third point, which, I believe, brings us to the crux of the whole problem—Mr. Fusz himself perceives that as soon as the *practical* workers of his proposed society got busy they would be obliged by the logical necessities of the case to set up the very thing for which I have been contending, and which I believe should *precede* the establishment of the daily press, namely, the news bureau: an organization for gathering and distributing Catholic news and views.

Let us pause here and ask ourselves this question. Suppose a Catholic millionaire should give \$1,000,000 tomorrow (it is a wild and whirling supposition, I know, but let us exercise our imagination), to found a Catholic

daily, what would he or his editors put in the paper? Or, suppose that a group of earnest, poor Catholics, or a society, scraped together a few dollars, and got out a small daily paper, what would *they* put in their paper? I give these two suppositions, because there are two schools of thought about the Catholic daily, one, namely, which sees it a big, wealthy, up-to-date affair, rivaling the great secular papers, nay, even utterly eclipsing them; the other urging the publication of small, modest papers. Yes, I repeat, what would either of these groups put in their paper? Why, Catholic news, of course, do I hear somebody reply? All right, but now I ask another question: Where are they going to get their news? Or, more to the point, how are they going to get their news?

Now, perhaps, to most people, this question will not seem difficult to answer; nor will they see the mass of problems which its consideration presents to the man who has had practical newspaper experience. Most people seem to think that news just happens, and gets itself automatically recorded morning and evening in the papers. Those who have a partial knowledge of the press are aware of the existence of reporters, but that is about as far as they get; and for most people the image of the reporter has come to them from the stage or cheap magazine: the image of a brisk, preternaturally acute young man, a cigarette dangling from his lower lips, notebook and pencil in hand. As for envisioning the exceedingly complex, exceedingly costly, constantly changing and diversifying machinery, with its local, national, and international ramifications, through which modern newspapers operate, and without which they *cannot* operate, well, they simply don't see it at all.

Let us go one step further with our supposition. Let us suppose that our philanthropic millionaire, or our enthusiastic group, has started a Catholic daily. A staff of editors, writers, and reporters has been organized. So too has a business staff. The editors, reporters, and writers are well chosen, and competent persons. And they gather the Catholic news of their city, and present it well; and they gather the non-Catholic news of their city, or such of it as they can handle without tongs or garbage hooks or gas masks, and present *it* well. All right, but what of State news, inter-State news, national news, international news? Where are they going to get it? How are they going to get it?

Oh, says somebody, the forthcoming Catholic daily will buy a paper with an Associated Press or United Press or International Press or Universal Press or Scripps-McRae franchise and service. Then it will have its inter-State, its national and international news.

But would it be Catholic news? Do the existing press agencies pay adequate attention to Catholic news? How does the Associated Press, for example, get its news? Through its own reporters in the larger cities and towns, supplemented with the news gathered by the Associated Press papers, collected by the "A. P." offices in each city, and "swapped" around. And as a very large num-

ber indeed of our existing daily papers are owned, controlled, and operated in the interests of Jews, Protestants, or neo-pagans, such papers pay but small attention to Catholic news and Catholic views. Remember, also, that "news" is not always, or perhaps not even mainly an objective, positive thing. On the contrary, a great deal of "news" consists of happenings, actions, and opinions, as understood and expressed for others to understand, by men and women who judge all things from at least a non-Catholic view, if not an anti-Catholic view. For instance, take a divorce among "prominent people." Such an event, as its details are gathered by a non-Catholic "lady reporter" with a personal axe to grind in the interests of "liberty of life," illustrated by a comic artist, to whom it's all a huge, libidinous joke, headlined and edited by a copyreader "who knows what his paper wants," published in the paper of an editor who is paying alimony to two wives because he married a third who was rich; such an event, I say, may be "news," but is it Catholic news? This is of course a very extreme case; but let us take something else. Let us take the case of a labor controversy reported, written, and edited from either a capitalistic or Socialistic point of view, but ignoring, as ninety-nine out of a hundred reports do ignore, the Catholic point of view, the point of view of Leo XIII, and of all sound Catholic sociology, based on the rock of everlasting Truth, such "news," I say, is typical of the kind of news supplied by the great agencies to their clients. In short, "news" in the final deduction depends for its "tendency," for the force of its lessons, explicit or implicit, upon the philosophy or religion, or lack of either, of those who make it, who report it, and who sell and distribute it. This is the great, fundamental truth about the power of the press. This is why, for a menacing example, Germany tried to get control of the news agencies of other countries. The "color" which "news" assumes; the policies which it is manipulated to support; its texture, its appeal, its power or lack of power—everything at bottom is a question of the *mode of thought* of those who gather and distribute it.

This is why I, as a practical newspaper man, cry out so loudly for the formation of a really practical and solidly organized Catholic news bureau, nationally and internationally organized. This is why I believe such a news gathering and distributing system must come *before* the formation of daily papers.

With such a news bureau at work, its product, news dispatches, local, national, and foreign; special articles, editorial interviews, etc., etc., would be at first distributed among our existing Catholic weeklies, causing an immense improvement, and among secular papers, causing at least a Catholic tinge to appear here and there. Then, with this agency at its back, some brave and vigorous diocesan weekly paper will take the plunge and become a daily, or a brand-new daily will be started. If such an experiment should succeed, and, if properly handled, it will succeed, other weeklies, or other news-

papers, will follow the successful example. They will be bound together for cooperative national action by the central bureau, but left free for local action, each following out its own local method or policy, so we shall have at last Catholic daily papers from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from Canada to Mexico, acting in conjunction with their allied weekly papers in the more thinly populated districts.

A really efficient news gathering and news distributing system, then, is the necessary and indispensable foundation not only for immediate and widespread Catholic publicity, but also for the Catholic daily press.

The Discoverer of Christian Science

FRANCES BEATTIE

THOUGH Christian Science was "discovered" by a woman, it is decreed that no other woman shall ever come to the fore with a new scientific revelation, and the head of the Publishing Society must likewise be a man. That question has been forever settled. When Mrs. Mary Baker Glover Patterson Eddy was "impelled by a power not one's own" to write the "Church Manual" the Divine impulse did not stop there. It continued to dictate other things, all of which are published and sold by the Christian Science Publishing Society, and, incidentally, are a source of great income to the Mother Church. In one of her numerous volumes, "Miscellany," Mrs. Eddy reprints an interview given by her to the New York *Herald*, May 1, 1901, in which she says: (page 343) "You would ask, perhaps, whether my successor will be a woman or a man. I can answer that. It will be a man," but Mrs. Eddy added that she could not name the man at that time. Whereat there was a great furore in Science circles. Every man high in the councils of the discoverer began to preen his feathers and get ready for an ascension to the throne of the leader. But Mrs. Eddy quickly corrected this error by giving an interview to the Associated Press, May 16, 1901, which she also reprints in "Miscellany" (page 346): "I did say that a man would be my successor. By this I did not mean any man today on earth." Thereat her male followers were cast down.

"Has Mrs. Eddy a successor?" I asked of a reading-room attendant. "Are her powers delegated to the present pastor of the Mother Church?" That official was plainly displeased and answered peevishly:

"Your own common sense should answer that: Could there be another Jesus? Mrs. Eddy discovered Science and gave it to us. It is our part to develop it, according to the power that is in us. Science can never be discovered again. There can never be another Leader."

While the Divine power took so particular a care of the finances of Mrs. Eddy, even to the point of declaring through Mrs. Eddy, of course, that should the preaching and teaching of Christian Science cease, the property should revert to the heirs of Mrs. Eddy, it paid little attention to guiding her footsteps prior to her dis-

covery of Science. The deed of trust, conveying land for the church edifice ("Church Manual," page 133:10), ordains that:

Whenever said directors shall determine that it is inexpedient to maintain preaching, reading or speaking in said church in accordance with the terms of this deed, they are authorized and required to reconvey forthwith said lot of land with the building thereon to Mary Baker G. Eddy, her heirs and assigns forever by a proper deed of conveyance.

While the Divine power, working through Mrs. Eddy, provided that the profits of the Christian Science Publishing Society should be given to the Mother Church, and gave power to the Board of Directors to expend the funds, it is not at all unlikely that it was never intended that the vast funds should be used to finance a campaign against all things Catholic. To such uses, however, have the funds been used, for it is admitted that all deficits of the anti-Catholic *Monitor* are met from these funds. Special correspondents traveling broadcast in the furtherance of an anti-Catholic campaign, even the agents of the "Business Committee," might well be used as agents to promote this intolerance and abuse, all under the terms laid down by the Divine thought that whispered constantly into the ears of Mrs. Eddy minute details regarding the finances of the church which she founded.

Mrs. Eddy herself probably never dreamed that the Christian Science Church would enter into such a campaign. On page 303 of "Miscellany" she declares that "Christian Scientists have no quarrel with Protestants, Catholics or any other sect." True, she forbade the teaching of Christian Science to Roman Catholics, "without the written consent of the authority of their Church," though she "left to the wisdom of the practitioner" the choice of healing people of all sects. The first husband of Mrs. Eddy, George Washington Glover, was a Freemason, and that fact may have something to do with the fear Mrs. Eddy seemed to have of teaching Science to the Catholic people!

Her second husband, Dr. Daniel Patterson, described some years ago by *McClure's Magazine* as "an itinerant dentist," was divorced by the founder of the Christian Science Church. Mrs. Eddy could never quite reconcile herself to the thought that Patterson was itinerant, and in "Miscellany" she describes his staying qualities and higher attainments. She says, page 314: "Although as *McClure's Magazine* claims, the court record may state that my divorce from Dr. Patterson was granted on the ground of desertion, the cause, nevertheless, was adultery." She relates that an irate husband was about to have Daniel arrested for eloping with his wife, and that when this evidence was introduced "the court instructed the clerk to record the divorce in my favor." Later, she avers that she reconciled the couple whom the gay Daniel had separated, and she gives Dr. Patterson a graceful exit by declaring that she "lived with him peaceably and he was kind up to the time of the divorce."

Page 268 of "Miscellany" gives an article on the "Prevention and Cure of Divorce." So, had Daniel Pat-

erson lived long enough, and had Asa Gilbert Eddy, the third husband, not put in an appearance, the Christian Science Church might not have been compelled to go down into history as a church invented and founded by a divorced woman.

In some churches it might be a trifle difficult to accept a divorcee as the instrument of Divine power to discover a new religion. True, it should not be too difficult for Mr. Frederick Dixon of London, England, made famous by the Church of Henry VIII. In fact, Mr. Dixon now and then shows a queer fondness for the Church of England. He writes and waxes wroth at the very mention of the name of Cardinal O'Connell, and seems possessed of a haunting fear that the Cardinal has designs on the politics of America, with the Pope aiding and abetting from Rome. But he does not at all mind the approach of the Archbishop of York to American shores. Rather, Mr. Dixon delights in the prospect, declaring in an editorial last March that "the mission of the Archbishop of York to the United States is a keen reminder that there are other than material forces at work in binding the English-speaking races together."

When Mr. Dixon poisons the columns of the *Monitor*, however, with imaginary tales of the Catholic Hierarchy following the example set by the Scientists, the Methodists and the other dissenting brethren, and interfering in politics, he throws up his hands in holy horror at the very thought that he is launching an anti-Catholic campaign. In an editorial, "The Collar Black and Chestnut Wig," printed in the *Christian Science Monitor*, March 21, Mr. Dixon said, in speaking of Canadian politics:

If it would not be asking too much, it would be interesting if Mr. Murphy would inform the house the next time he speaks where he procured the information that the *Christian Science Monitor* was engaged in launching an anti-Roman Catholic campaign. . . . We have a suspicion that Mr. Murphy's information must have growed, like Topsy, out of his imagination.

Let us see. Not many weeks ago Mr. Dixon advised a fellow-journalist to study certain issues of the *Christian Science Monitor* for light on the anti-Catholic movement. He also advised careful reading of the *Monitor*, as very many more such articles would follow. The issues of the *Monitor* to which Mr. Dixon referred the journalist were placed, in large numbers, for free distribution in the reading rooms of the Science Church, scattered throughout this country, and it is presumed such free distribution was also accorded to European reading rooms. The papers containing the articles in question were also marked and mailed to the editors of the country and were distributed liberally through the public schools.

Mr. Dixon would like to know how the information that the *Christian Science Monitor* was engaged in launching an anti-Catholic campaign was procured. Let the answer be a reference to the *Monitor*. For convenience, taking the issue of June 13 last, the front page contains an article from the eastern bureau of the *Christian Science Monitor*, bearing the title, "Benefits from

the Wilson Mexican Address Forecast." It is dated New York, and is of sufficient importance to be styled a "special" to the *Monitor*. It gives an interview with Manuel Carpio, editor of *Le Voz de la Revolution*, of Yucatan. From it it is only necessary to quote the last paragraph:

Mr. Carpio said that Carranza's chief opposition came from the Roman Catholics, who fought him because he, like President Juarez, had done his best to separate them as a Church from the affairs of State, and especially from public education. He said also that the chief reason why Carranza was promoting democracy, freedom and the education of the masses was the fact that centuries of control of education by the Roman Catholic clericals had still left ninety-five per cent of the common people illiterate.

Page 7 of the same issue of the *Monitor* contains another special, this time through its western bureau, at Chicago. The article is entitled "Church and State Opposed," and relates the righteous political activity of a certain set of Methodist, Baptist and other ministers, banded together as the "Chicago Church Federation Council." The *Monitor* says the Council represents 600 individual churches, its President being Herbert L. Willett, a member of the faculty of the theological school of the University of Chicago. Considerable space is given the article, and the *Monitor* declares:

The practice which has grown up in Cook County, as in fact in many places all over the United States, of appropriating large sums of money for services performed by sectarian institutions in taking care of dependent children of the county, was laid before the Church Federation Council by Rev. W. S. Fleming, Superintendent of the Methodist Mutual Aid Union of Chicago. This organization handles Methodist charity work in Chicago. Mr. Fleming came into the case through study of it as chairman of a committee on public funds and sectarian institutions of the Chicago Methodist Ministers Meeting, and also of a similar committee of the Rock River Methodist Conference, including Chicago.

The *Monitor* prints the resolutions passed by these worthy brethren, one of them declaring that "We hold that such use of public funds is in effect a union of Church and State . . . and thus a violation of the constitutions of both the United States and the State of Illinois."

In its attempt to "separate" Church and State, the *Monitor* adds:

The foregoing resolutions were transmitted to Mr. Fleming in the following communication:

"My Dear Mr. Fleming: The attitude of the churches of Chicago toward the sectarian appropriation of public funds, and toward the recent decision of the Supreme Court of Illinois in the case of Dunn vs. Chicago Industrial School for Girls, is seen in the enclosed resolutions, which were adopted today by unanimous vote. Fraternally yours,

HERBERT L. WILLETT."

The *Monitor* concludes:

Both of these letters were forwarded, in copy, to Protestant ministers in the Fifth Judicial District of Illinois last week, in connection with the campaign of Judge C. C. Craig for re-election to the State Supreme Court. Judge Craig was a member of the court when it handed down the decision objected to.

You see, to Mr. Dixon, good Scientist that he is, it matters a lot whose ox is gored. It is praiseworthy busi-

ness for the Protestant clergy to circularize the Protestant members requesting them to defeat a judge who had done justice to Catholic orphans, but a like condition in Catholic circles would invite the wrath of the gods. Being a Scientist, Mr. Dixon may not be able to see the fine Italian hand running through the pages of the *Monitor*, furnishing proof of the fact that it is diligently engaged in conducting an anti-Catholic campaign of calumny.

The Report on Religious Prejudices

HAROLD HALL

THE final report of the Commission on Religious Prejudices has been placed before the public in pamphlet form by the Knights of Columbus. Col. P. H. Callahan in the foreword explains that the commission's activities did not bear upon the individual, personal sentiment of prejudice, but upon the collective or "social sentiment which moves in waves and comes and goes in periods." Not surrendering anything due Catholic citizens, the Commission in its labor stressed citizenship and asked all Americans without distinction of creed to combat the professional propagandist. A direct appeal to the American spirit of fair play sums up the attitude adopted. It is the conviction of the members of the Commission that even before the war came upon the land the backbone of the anti-Catholic campaign had been broken. It was still running in the eventful April of 1917, but running on waning momentum only.

For instance when the Commission was created there were about sixty anti-Catholic papers appearing in different parts of the country. Many of them had a very wide circulation, from 100,000 to nearly 1,500,000. At the beginning of the year 1917 there were only two or three of these being issued. The year the Commission was created anti-Catholic legislation in one or another form was attempted in over forty legislatures. Within the last year (1917) only five such efforts have been made.

According to the opinion of the Commission, the wave of intolerance always follows definite lines. Its spirit is one of hate and passionate malice; its aim, the destruction of reputations and the shattering of ideals. Its promoters are men with small good to their credit, unscrupulous and scheming; they stoop to extremely dishonest means, playing one prejudice against another until the public is really victimized. "The real bigots are relatively few." Such is the conclusion reached by the men who formed the Commission and who found that no class of citizens in America was unwilling to listen to a calm statement of the Catholic position.

It is well pointed out that what is put on trial during the excitement of an anti-Catholic campaign is not the Catholic Church. She is above and beyond the weapons of her enemies. Her life is secured to her by Divine assurance, her rock-ribbed foundation can weather any storm, and no movement, however strong, can endanger her ultimate success. Democratic citizenship is really what is endangered by the bigoted propagandist. You cannot have cooperation and community spirit in a small community, or in a big nation, if all the citizens are not given the credit for good-will, if the religious test is made the criterion of patriotism. The dominant note running through the entire report seems to be the need of bringing all citizens together to discuss their differences. As an instance of the good accomplished by such a peace plan, the report cites the example of the Committee of One Hundred that convened in Buffalo in 1916 at the suggestion of Rev. L. O. Williams, Universalist pastor of the Church of the Messiah. There were fifty Catholics and fifty Protestants and an executive committee of ten was formed from the entire group which formulated the following manifesto:

We, the undersigned citizens of Buffalo, desiring to remove all religious intolerance from our city, believe the task of overcoming such a spirit can be undertaken only "with malice toward none and charity for all."

We must constantly keep in mind that our national constitution provides that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office of public trust under the United States," and that "Congress shall make no law regarding the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." And again we should remember that our own State constitution insures that "the free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship without discrimination or preference shall forever be allowed in this State to all mankind."

Moreover, our people of various religious beliefs wish to live together as friends and neighbors, to the end that in business, civic and social life, we may associate in peace and harmony, and banish from our midst the un-American spirit of intolerance.

With this preamble, the committee asked the citizens of Buffalo to discourage printing, circulating and reading all publications containing any misrepresentation or vilification of any religion, to ban all secret and public meetings where religious feelings were outraged, and to urge upon all the need of religious tolerance.

What was accomplished in Buffalo was carried out on a larger scale throughout the State of Georgia by the Association of Catholic Laymen, who joined together to combat the anti-Catholic feeling that was rampant at the time of the Veasy Convent Inspection bill. They called for \$7,500 to carry on a "get-acquainted" campaign whereby every citizen of Georgia, through pamphlets, correspondence and news articles, might be brought to a knowledge of the doctrines of their fellow citizens belonging to the Catholic Church. The Association stated its purpose plainly:

The aim of our organization is to bring about more friendly relations between all the people of Georgia, irrespective of religious convictions. We have no other aim. We are not seeking converts to Catholicism. We are not playing politics. We are not out for reforming or opposing or fighting anybody. We have no axe to grind and no scores to pay. We have no new laws to propose and no new principles to teach. We have absolutely no interest that is not common to all good citizens. We stand for friendship. Opposing all manner of discord, condemning every form of ill-will, frowning on religious prejudices as a cause of internal dissension, we stand for that sympathy and unity, for that friendship among citizens which the common history, the common interest, the common destiny of all the people of Georgia make imperative in the fulfilment of their hopes and aims.

These are times when all men are divided into two camps, the fair-minded and the foolish; we are ready to stand up and be counted. We ask our fellow citizens to find out about us; but do it from first hand sources. We will answer any questions kindly, give out any information cheerfully, state our principles and our beliefs over and over again for all who wish to know them. We invite the cooperation, the confidence, the good will and the understanding sympathy of all our fellow citizens. We offer these dispositions to our fellow citizens.

Mr. J. J. Farrell, who managed the campaign of the Catholic Laymen of Georgia, inserted a paid advertisement into a number of papers throughout the State guaranteeing to answer any questions in explanation of Catholic doctrine. Questions of all kinds came pouring in and their range covered a wide field. So satisfactory was the result of the Georgia plan that it has been officially approved by the Knights of Columbus commission and recommended as a program to be followed in different localities, with proper adaptation to local needs.

There is a note of optimism running through the entire report of the Commission on Religious Prejudices. It is difficult to conclude that there is warrant for this optimism that is born of the belief that on account of the war the anti-Catholic feeling has died down almost entirely. "The war will kill bigotry" is a statement that remains to be proved. Certainly the persistent and concerted efforts that are made in the press with

striking regularity to discredit the Pope in the eyes of the world are not very strong arguments favoring an optimistic view. Whether the attacks on the Holy See are inspired by a worldwide propaganda or are home products it is difficult to determine. They bear watching, however. The Knights of Columbus have done well through the labors of their Commission, and on the whole their work deserves praise. The conclusion that they have reached, namely, that the war has made the anti-Catholic feeling a thing of the past, is one that many who have followed the anti-Papal wave as it rises in the press of the land cannot accept. When the actions of the Holy See get a fair hearing in the secular press, then the contention that intolerance as a movement is dead can be admitted by all. Until then many will refuse to admit the effect-of-the-war conclusion.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letters as a rule should not exceed six-hundred words

The Angelus at St. Paul's Chapel

To the Editor of AMERICA:

St. Paul's Chapel, of Trinity parish, "where Washington used to pray," is laying itself open to rebuke by the *Christian Science Monitor* for posting on its Broadway fence, in full view of every passer, a sign which says "The midday Angelus is rung daily at 12 o'clock as a call to prayer."

New York.

T. C.

Spiritual Adoption

To the Editor of AMERICA:

During these days when we are doing so much for our soldiers and sailors, even to the point of "adopting" them, why not do something in the way of spiritual adoption? Surely in our vast army and navy there are many who have no one to pray for them, many whose relatives do not believe in God. A *Memorare*, every day, an intention in Mass or Holy Communion, would not, I am sure, lessen our fervor in praying for those dear to us, and for the sailors and soldiers collectively.

New York.

M. F.

Accountancy

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I read with some interest the letter of D. C. L. appearing in AMERICA for September 14, relative to public accountants. I quote from his letter the following: "I would not recommend aspirants to enter any of the day or night schools of accountancy, as in these institutions pupils acquire only a theoretical knowledge of accounts." This is very poor advice. It would be as logical to say, I shall not study English in a school, but will learn it by listening to others speak, regardless of the recognized rules governing this subject which I might acquire very easily in a night or day course. He recommends that young men should first enter a mercantile concern in order to acquire a thorough knowledge of bookkeeping, and afterwards enter the offices of a competent firm of public accountants.

What mercantile concern, as such, will give a man all the knowledge he requires to fit him for entrance into the office of a public accountant? Will D. C. L. draw the line and say that the young man should first acquire a theoretical knowledge of bookkeeping before entering the mercantile concern, and thereafter trust to circumstances in order to obtain the knowledge essential for the intelligent practice of public accountancy? Is bookkeeping in itself accountancy? It certainly is not. The fact that a man is a certified public accountant, which certification is the State's official stamp of approval, is *prima facie* evidence of competency, though in this profession, as in all others, there are different degrees of competency.

It is estimated that there are about 2,500 certified public accountants in the United States. What is his foundation for saying that "It is a well-known fact that non-certified public accountants in this country command larger salaries than cer-

tified public accountants"? I am sure that he did not make a comparison between 2,500 non-certified public accountants and the same number of public accountants. He certainly has not sent me, nor others I know, any blank to fill out for statistical purposes. Who ever made compensation the determining factor of competency?

I am a certified public accountant, licensed by the States of New York and New Jersey upon examination, both of which States require as a condition for the obtaining of the degree of C. P. A., certified public accountant, among others, practical experience in accountancy, the number of years required differing in different States; and while I have had over ten years' practical experience in public accountancy, I would certainly consider my training incomplete without having taken a course in one of the schools of accountancy.

I would strongly urge our Catholic men to study this profession, and, if they have the required preliminary education, to pursue their course with the end in view of obtaining the degree of C. P. A. It is a field that is not overcrowded, and I look forward to the time when our Catholic institutions of learning will adopt in their curriculum the courses necessary to train those eager to learn, so that the growing demand for competent accountants will be met. Some of our Catholic institutions of learning have already established courses in this subject, and I hope that others will soon follow.

East Orange, N. J.

T. J. C.

An Analysis of Socialism

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Under the title, "Two Views Questioned," the New York *Call*, under date of September 25, criticizes "An Analysis of Socialism," recently published in AMERICA. The first statement that is questioned is, "Marx teaches, preposterous though it seems, that it is under capitalistic competition that the worker gets the full value of his labor." The editor of the *Call* says: "The values he produces during a day and the value his labor power realizes in the market are different matters altogether."

It happens that in 1913, there was a discussion in the columns of the *Call* on the question of the exploitation of labor. Under date of August 6 of that year, in an editorial leader, the challenge was tossed off by its editor, in part, as follows:

We want to see this question thrashed out, and so no doubt do the majority of our readers. If the surplus value theory is unsound and the reasoning on which it is based will not stand every intellectual assault that may be directed against it, we want to know it. If it can be proved that the capitalist gets nothing from the laborer for which he does not return a full equivalent, then the bottom drops out of Socialism. Surplus value in plain, untechnical language means nothing more nor less than this.

We are well satisfied to have this thing come to a "show down," and let the anti-Marxians make good their assumptions and assertions on the field of intellectual debate.

While the invitation was tendered specifically to one anti-Marxian, who was also a Socialist, it was not advertised as strictly private. Having doubts that there would be a debate between the principals invited, the writer submitted his view of the question, in which he forestalled the criticism now made by the *Call*. The following is quoted from the last paragraph of a letter published in the *Call* in the early part of August, 1913:

It is generally agreed that the workers receive the full value of their labor. Competition sees to it that the value of commodities approximates the cost of the labor embodied in them. Then there is no difference between the workers receiving the full value of their labor and receiving the full value of the product of their labor.

The *Call*'s second point of criticism of "An Analysis of Socialism," is the statement that "economic determinism" is akin to fatalism. Yet, the criticism proves more than was charged. The fact that Socialists organize and maintain active educational work, does not exculpate them; it is evident that they do it "in

order to bring about the easy and safe birth of Socialism." They presume that Socialism must come, against the efforts of men.

Providence.

M. P. CONNERY.

A Tribute to Catholicism

To the Editor of AMERICA:

What the war has brought home to many of our Protestant friends in religious experience is the definiteness of the Catholic religion, its adaptability to all classes, to all nationalities, to all grades of intelligence, and its appeal to reason, the affections, faith, under all the diverse conditions of camp-life, of men of all races.

The Protestant Bishop of Massachusetts, Dr. Lawrence, is not classed among the "advanced" clergy of his denomination. Nevertheless, in a recent issue of the Protestant New York *Churchman*, he pays his tribute to Catholicism. Speaking of his visit to the camps, he said that he had seen Christianity represented in three distinct ways: First, by the Catholic Church through the religious ministrations in the K. C. huts. "The Church has the great advantage of standing four-square for certain religious facts: the Mass, Confession, Absolution, and Extreme Unction. It is most impressive." Second, by the Y. M. C. A. "So far as religion and the teaching of religion goes, it is a very different story. . . . What the soldiers get there religiously is very vague and in no way continuously gripping." He dismisses the description of religious results in the camps, through the Episcopal Church, in about three lines: "Small numbers at early services, seldom an officer present. Then continuous personal work throughout the day all over the camp."

One may ask of this earnest and able New England religious leader, not cynically or unkindly, but in all Christian charity, the following question: If, as the young theologians whom he was addressing had been taught to believe, the Mass "is repugnant to the words of Scripture," if Confession and Absolution and Extreme Unction, together with Matrimony and Ministerial Orders, are no more "Sacraments of the Gospel," than the saluting of our flag, how does he explain that these "many superstitions" have power to draw hardy, red-blooded men together, freely, by thousands, to kneel, in the "hut" on the rude earth, before the Incarnate God, for the Mass is God tabernacling among men, to every Catholic soldier? If auricular Confession is a "corruption," how is it that these ordinary men, from intelligent officers like Foch to unskilled privates, kneel in penitence, and, before a fellow-sinner, own again and again the reality of sin in their own lives, cry out for assurance of pardon, through the Blood of the Cross, and for the prayers of angels and men for victory over foes they fear more than the Hun himself, and, at last, desire preparation for the life of the world to come, while the assumed greater purity of the two hundred amalgamated Protestant bodies awaken only interest in being interested in matters "in no way continuously gripping"?

Of the Y. M. C. A. activities he most justly says: "Admirable in its effective social work, yet entirely inadequate to lead men in worship, spiritual direction, or Biblical instruction." By his very comparisons, he seems to admit that, somehow, the Mass does lead men voluntarily to worship; Confession, to a very real and personal spiritual direction; and Extreme Unction, to a most practical demonstration of the Biblical instruction of St. James.

The reason for this contrast is no doubt, in part at least, that whereas the Catholic Church does "stand four-square" for religious facts, Protestantism does not. Dr. Lawrence is not the only honest Protestant who, unintentionally, has borne witness to the fact that the Catholic Sacraments do hold men and women to God definitely, thus making them faithful to the end, *Pro Deo, pro Ecclesia, et pro patria*.

San Francisco.

GEORGE BRABA.

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1918

Entered as second-class matter, April 15th, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3d, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

Published weekly by the America Press, New York.
 President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSLIN;
 Treasurer, FRANCIS A. BRENN

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:
 United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$3.00
 Canada, \$3.50
 Europe, \$4.00

Address:
 THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
 CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW
Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

The Fourth Liberty Loan

AS these lines are written, preparations for the active work of floating the Fourth Liberty Loan are completed. For the fourth time the enemy will see of what stuff are the American people whom, with a fatuity beyond all comprehension, he goaded into war. No American has any doubt of the outcome of the conflict. It may take months, it may take years, but the armies of the United States and of the Allied Powers will never give up the fight they have entered in the name of liberty, until the infamous Power which has set the world in flames, is forever broken.

It rests with us, in large measure, to shorten the time of conflict. Thousands of young Americans are now fighting in France, thousands upon thousands are preparing in the training camps at home, and within the past month 13,000,000 American citizens were registered by the War Department. These millions represent the military power, actual and potential, of the country. It is for us, who in all probability shall not be asked to serve our country in the field or trench, to leave nothing undone which will aid the Government in its stupendous task of equipping these forces and adding them at the earliest possible moment to our gallant armies across the sea. We cannot buy victory, but we can buy those things which bring victory nearer. United in the "drive" for the Fourth Liberty Loan, we shall do all that the Government asks, and more. There must, then, be no faltering, and if the previous loans afford ground for prophecy, there will be none.

Humanity and justice, indeed, urge all possible cooperation with the Government in making the loan a

success, yet it should not be forgotten that a four and one-quarter per cent Liberty Bond is one of the safest and most productive investments in the market. It is underwritten by the United States of America, a Government which, under God, shall exist for the benefit of mankind in that far distant day when "Hohenzollern" shall be recalled only as the name of a Power which sought world-domination by the violation of laws and covenants sacred in the eyes of God and man.

Catholic Women Voters

THE Catholic women of New York are to be congratulated on the establishment of a course of lectures on American citizenship, its privileges and its duties. One purpose of this course will be to teach women to vote regularly and intelligently. What the vote is, what it can do, should do, and cannot do, are topics to be explained by men and women of experience in public life, who will bring to their unique task enthusiasm as well as intelligence.

The course is intended for women, but why cannot a similar course be arranged for men, not only in New York, but throughout the country? There is no reason whatever to believe that it would be superfluous, and every reason to think that, if party politics were rigidly excluded, it would be a great help towards building up a wall of defense for every community in which it might be established. The exercise of the elective franchise is the private citizen's participation in government. We have no monarchies or dynasties; it is our constitutional right to choose our rulers and to reject them, not by force of arms but by force of the vote. Municipal government, the rule which normally touches the citizen most closely, is the form of government most keenly responsive to the action of the citizen at the polls, and a poorly governed community is the almost necessary consequence of an ill-instructed or careless electorate. Too many Americans do not take "the trouble" to vote at all, and many who do go to the polls, know very little of the questions at issue. They exercise the franchise with the intelligence attributed by Mr. Dooley of Archey Road to Mr. Dugan. "'I voted for Charter Haitch,' says he, 'an' he's a good man.' 'Why, man alive,' says I, 'Charter Haitch was assassinated three years ago.' 'Was he?' says Dugan. 'Ah, well, he's lived that down be this time.'"

Woman has had no generous chance to show what she will do with the franchise in New York, but it is quite certain that if the new course of lectures is well attended, the monopoly of wisdom will not be with the male voter. The women will have learned, what too many men do not even suspect, that the vote is by no means a right, but wholly a privilege, and a privilege which carries with it a heavy responsibility. For the resultant difference between a vote carelessly cast and a vote conscientiously cast is very often the difference between a corrupt government and a government of, for and by the people.

What Think Ye of France?

UNDER the above title, Mgr. Alfred Baudrillart, historian, theologian, orator, rector of a great university, one-time foreign missioner, and recently elected to the place of the Count de Mun in the French Academy, asks the people of the world to look into their souls and read therein what is their present opinion of his native land. The question, which appeared in the *Bulletin de Propagande Française* of August 15, 1918, throbs with that consuming love of country and passionate devotion to God and His Church, which have always characterized the writing of the distinguished prelate, and especially his war-utterances.

After referring to prevalent opinions concerning France, he says: "You thought that France was a worn-out nation, given over to the pursuit of pleasure, light, incapable of serious effort; you said it was beaten before it began." Then he takes up the history of France's part in the struggle of the past four years; the vigor, courage, unassuming steadfastness of her people steeled to every suffering and privation; her young men, represented as soft, effeminate, decadent, but in the test facing death under most horrible forms and impassive under frightful fatigue; men of mature age grown grey from pain and yet constant in bearing arms; mere boys, not yet emancipated from paternal and maternal care, sharing the same weariness, taking the post of command and exacting obedience from their seniors by the sheer force of respect; her women, pictured as frivolous and inconstant in the extreme, performing the hardest kind of labor, and ministering, by night and by day, without rest, for four long years, to the sick, the wounded and the sorrowful.

The people, though divided beyond hope, have rallied as a single man, in the name of the *union sacrée*, have passed through frightful changes without social or political disturbance, have maintained an unalterable calm in victory as in defeat, and for the repression of internal dangers have never even dreamed of Danton's and Robespierre's guillotine. Believed to have lost all sense of religion, they have crowded the churches, and in their priests have found both consolers and comrades in arms. Even the Government, the child of former times and still officially without God and religion, is growing in tolerance and respect. All the nations of the world are flocking to France to support her cause, persuaded that it is the cause of Liberty, and Foch, a Frenchman, commands them all.

Calling on Catholic neutrals to aid Catholic France, to treat Frenchmen as brothers and not as suspects, to give to his country a share in their good-will instead of bestowing it on those who have trampled under foot both justice and humanity, Mgr. Baudrillart exclaims: "Look, all of you, and see! Go down into the depths of your consciences, sweep away superannuated prejudices, and tell us today, what think ye of France?" There is only one answer to the question, the answer

Mgr. Baudrillart expects: France is herself once more, glorious, heroic, wonderful France.

A Call for Nurses

FROM the office of the Surgeon-General of the War Department an urgent call has been issued, asking properly qualified young women to take up the profession of nursing. Contradicting certain recent press dispatches which represented that "in answer to General Gorgas' appeal for 25,000 nurses by January 1, 1919, more than 27,000 graduate nurses have been enrolled," Captain J. P. Yoder of the army writes to point out the serious loss which may arise from reports so utterly unfounded. "There are thousands today," he protests, "who now believe that the army no longer needs nurses." The real facts are, first, by January 1, the army must add at least 8,000 nurses to the 17,000 now in the service, and next, according to the Surgeon-General, 25,000 more must be obtained by July 1, 1919.

The situation is serious and can be met in only one way. The professional school for the nurse must assume a far higher place in our estimation than it has hitherto occupied. In modern medical practice, the trained nurse is indispensable, and today the nurse whose main qualifications are a kind heart and a good intention, is almost as out of place as the gin-swilling Sairey Gamp. The difficulty at hand is not merely to provide for the present war needs, although these must take precedence, but to meet the needs of hospitals at home, both now and after the war. If these needs are to be met adequately, it is imperative that as many young women as possible be induced to enter high-grade training schools for nurses. The adjective is chosen of set purpose; not every school is "high grade." Already, many whose sole purpose is to defraud trusting students, under a cloak of patriotism, are in the field.

To the Catholic young woman, the profession of nursing should appeal, because of the unique opportunities which it offers for the practice of the spiritual as well as of the corporal works of mercy. In the early days of Christianity, the physician of the soul was often the physician of the body, and it is an old saying among Catholics that the physician is the priest's best helper. Today the nurse may well be added to their company. Many an invalid has been brought back to spiritual as well as to physical health, by the skilful ministrations of some womanly woman who recognized the profession of nursing as a sacred trust and a true vocation. But no triflers, no "flappers," no frivolous creatures whose heads are merely a substructure for their blondined hair, need apply. The task calls for women, not for dolls or flirts.

The Workman and the Church

"HOW draw workmen to Church?" Such is the question Vida D. Scudder, in her article written for the September number of the *American*

Church Monthly, an Anglican publication, pictures herself asking at a meeting of religious and social workers. "The Roman Catholics do it," is the prompt reply that greets her, followed by a chorus of assent. "Their church is on the same block with my home in Vermont," adds the first speaker, "There are five Masses on Sunday. The people come pouring out, more than half of them men. Crowds of men."

"It's the same near me," says a lady from Connecticut in confirmation. "I hear the patter of their feet at six in the morning." To make the testimony complete a social worker relates: "There was a mission held in our district last winter. Our streets are not nice at night, you know; one hears horrid things. But one night, just after some drunken men had passed, a man went by whistling the Invocation to the Holy Spirit which they sang at the mission; and I felt better." Catholic men are not accustomed to whistle their church hymns along the streets or elsewhere; but they may be seen, not singly, but by scores and hundreds, before the dawn has yet broken, pouring through the open portals of some great city church where a mission is being held. Many come fasting that they may receive their Lord in His Eucharistic feast before they approach their daily labors.

The fact is undeniable. But how explain the obvious contrast between Protestant and Catholic churches? This puzzled the learned meeting, snugly gathered in its cozy library. "It's the discipline," some one suggested. "It's enforced confession." "It's catching the children." But what compulsion can the Church exercise over the free, intelligent, wide-awake American workingman to make him accept her discipline? Why should he sacrifice his Saturday evening as well as his Sunday morning to attend to the welfare of his soul by confessing his sins in anticipation of the Holy Communion on the morrow? As for the children, it is one thing to "catch" them, and quite another to hold them, when they have grown up into maturity. The mystery has only been made more insoluble for the Protestant mind.

But there is a solution. And it can be no other than the fact that the Catholic Church not merely dates back historically through her unbroken line of Pontiffs, to the days of Christ and His Apostles, but that she is the only Church that has preserved intact every word of His teaching and every institution of His Divine love for man. At the stable of Bethlehem, in the workshop of Nazareth, beneath the Cross on Calvary she has learned to make her own the poor and lowly of the earth. In Christ Himself, the Carpenter of Nazareth, she has beheld the dignity of labor. The fullness of His spirit, His teachings and His Sacraments can be found with her alone. At her altars all are equally welcome, and all are embraced by her with the same motherly affection that is fondest towards the lowliest and the weakest. Her churches are not mere "auditoriums," but temples of the living, Eucharistic Christ: "God with us."

The Church has done much for the workman, but there is doubtless much more that as Catholics we can and must still do for him. At no time was such work more urgent than now. The rock of vantage that a toiler occupies at present, in the excessive demand for his labor, will soon crumble away from beneath his feet when our troops return to resume their former peaceful occupations. Now, therefore, is the season to study these great problems of future reconstruction so as to ward off misery and disaster from the nation. Here as elsewhere the Catholic Church must be determined to lead the way.

French-Canadians and the War

THE Canadian military situation has been another illustration of the well-known fact of how very rare and precious is the unteachable gift of tact. The French-Canadians, with a passionate devotion to France, its ideals, its religion, its language, are now brimming over with enthusiasm for the cause of the Allies. This is nothing new, it has been their attitude from the beginning. What is new in the situation is their response to the call to arms, that is, their response as a people, for individuals among them have long since been prodigal of their lives, heroic in sacrifice, and distinguished in service with the very bravest. Hitherto, however, their national pride, their racial prejudices, their legitimate demands have been given scant consideration. But at last, as is not unusual, the Government has found its way, through costly blunders, to the right way of dealing with the matter.

The principal reason why the French-Canadians have changed their attitude is their realization of the fact, that when God commands, obedience is paramount. The law of conscription, emanating from legitimate authority, has swept away all controversy. Cardinal Bégin's official organ, the *Semaine Religieuse*, summed up the situation admirably in the following words:

God seems to wish that the French-Canadian people should take their part in all the sacrifices of the war. The time for discussions is past; and no one will regret that they are over. He who draws the sword in defense of a just cause is somewhat like the man who puts his hand to the plough: he should not look back. The command of authority is precise: young French-Canadians will march forth with courage. Their obedience, sanctioned by their spirit of faith, will lead them to victory. . . . It is in the midst of great trials that a Catholic people prove their faith. Our people are setting out to fight on the battlefields of France, to which sovereign authority, their French blood and their heroic history, all invite them; their inspiration is their love of justice and their respect for authority. It is easy, therefore, for our soldiers to give to their obedience a supernatural and a meritorious character.

These words are an echo of that great Catholic proclamation which has rung true to the voice of authority wherever there have been Catholic leaders to point out the path of duty. They have been reiterated by Cardinal Bégin himself and the great University of Laval. M. Adjutor Rivard, one of its most distinguished pro-

fessors, speaking in behalf of the province of Quebec, said to General Mewburn: :

The Heads of the nation can count on Quebec, on its understanding of the law, on its obedience to authority, an obedience inspired by love of justice, on its ardent desire to place all its energies at the service of its King and its country. . . . General, we give to our country all that we hold dearest, what we love more than ourselves, our sons. Of their own accord, before they were called, before they had reached the required age, they have gone, they are going, one and all. . . .

The Minister of Military Affairs, in responding, declared he never had any doubt concerning Quebec; in fact, he had nothing but praise to bestow on it. The province had always known, and would always know, as the future would prove, how to contribute its large

share to the honor of Canada. He, for his part, was endeavoring to have the just desires of the people realized in the formation of a French-Canadian army, commanded by French-Canadians both at home and at the front.

Had this attitude been adopted from the beginning, much bitterness would have been spared. The point to be insisted on, however, is this, that the highest military authorities of Canada have put themselves on record to the effect that the loyalty of Quebec has never been questioned. It is to be noted, moreover, that their glorious response to the law of conscription came before any concessions had been made to their legitimate demands. In the future carping critics should bear this in mind.

Literature

IBSEN IN SCANDINAVIA

WHEN one observes the manner of writing and speaking of many admirers of Ibsen, one recalls the rebuke given by Margaret Fuller to Emerson, on a certain occasion, when he praised superlatively the dancing of Fanny Ellsler. "This is life," he said. "No, Ralph," she answered, "this is religion." In our country, there seem to exist people who are capable of making the same observations where sin is concerned. Ibsen is a cult: Ibsen is not only life, but religion and philosophy.

In his native country, in Norway, this has never been so. In Denmark, where one of the most distinguished "creators" of his women's rôles, lives, there has never existed an Ibsen "cult," and in judging Ibsen, it ought not to be forgotten that his plays were made to be acted, not read. In Sweden, his comedies of manners and morals are played with other pieces in the *répertoire* of the actors; he has his fixed place, but no more. There are no "Ibsenites."

Strindberg is played more often there than Ibsen, but neither the bizarre, the eccentric, the decadent Strindberg nor the physiological Ibsen is looked on as a mentor of the meaning or conduct of life. Done in a Scandinavian environment, Strindberg has some meaning and interest. Out of it, he has little. Similarly "Peer Gynt," with Grieg's exquisitely national music, tells things worth hearing if one knows Norwegian political and social life. "Brand" has a more general appeal; there Ibsen, like the Danish philosopher, Kierkegaard, was groping, in fact he was always groping. Sitting at his table in the café of the Grand Hotel, Christiania, he sometimes, when he permitted himself to be disturbed, uttered sentiments which seemed as if, after all, the authority and all-embracing spiritual power of the Catholic Church appealed to him; and, if you read Ibsen's comedies of life seriously, or see them played by artists who know the Scandinavian conditions of the seventies, you will see that, in the absence of any authoritative interpretation of life, Ibsen takes life as he sees it, and offers the problem for you to solve. He does not solve it; it is an exercise in chemistry, and he thinks that the process is impersonal; the reactions are chemical reactions.

Ibsen's contemporary, Björnsen, takes life more humanly; he groped for a rule of the conduct of life, too. Lutheranism does not hold chastity as a great virtue in itself. Hegel expressed the Lutheran point of view when at an important gathering, under the patronage of the Prussian king, he lauded the German Lutheran Church, for having laid small emphasis on the "monkish" virtues of obedience, chastity and poverty, the antitheses of the noble old Roman qualities. Björnsen had a "cult": he wrote a play, to show that a man should live, before marriage,

as chaste a life as a woman. Many Norwegians were honestly shocked by this startling heresy, for Norwegian Lutheranism was rather liberal, but the revolt of both Björnsen and Ibsen was not against Christianity *per se*, but against the interpretation of religion as presented by the State Church.

Living in Scandinavia, though it is absurd to lump the three countries as if they were one people, it is easy to understand why their men became rebels. Coventry Patmore says somewhere that, when the real poet invokes his muse, he appeals to the Holy Ghost unconsciously. If I remember, I think he included Shelley among the gropers, those who made an appeal to the unknown God, Jehovah, Jove or Lord. The fact must be kept in mind that among these Northern peoples, the State Church represented religion, which was either an intolerant and illogical autocracy, forbidding even reasonable pleasures, as a purely formal cult, such as the State Church became in Russia. Religion, at its best, represented an unreasonable restraint. You were urged to interpret the Bible for yourself, and yet told that your life was to be governed by a set of rules, resting on an authority not infallible, which must be obeyed under the threat of eternal perdition! Ibsen does not protest against Christianity; he simply accepts the fact that Lutheran Christianity does not offer the individual an answer to the intricate problems of life.

Again, women in the North have no rights; they have privileges. When a Danish woman marries, her property, unless a special covenant is made, passes under the control of her husband; she must accept his dictum as to the disposal of it, but he can dispose of his own without her consent. Her children are solely his children; he determines their future, the quality of their education; the religion they must accept. Knowing these things, one can understand the ardent desire of the Norwegian, the Danish, the Swedish women, for the privilege of suffrage. Their only hope of changing the laws was by means of the ballot. In Denmark and Norway they have it now, so the fury of the revolt as depicted in some of Ibsen's best-known plays has spent itself. Given a fixed conventionalism, a conventionalism which repressed all individuality in women, and one must expect a revolt. The Lutheran scheme of salvation is too illogical to hold the clever individualists. The result was the determination to get the most out of this life. In the eyes of nearly all Ibsen's dramatic characters duty does not exist; the substitute for duty is conventionality.

The Norwegian and Danish and Swedish auditors were not shocked by, let us say, the physiology of "Ghosts." They are very plain-spoken people. Among them there are none of those "undivine silences" against which Coventry Patmore protests,

or even "Divine silences." Questions of sex are regarded as part of every-day life; so "Ghosts" dramatized a situation not unfamiliar to the every-day life of the people from whom it sprang. What stood in the way of Mrs. Aveling's emancipation from a condition of conjugal slavery? Convention, only convention. Of the release of the heroine of "A Doll's House," the same thing may be said; Nora Helmar's attitude created a storm in Ibsen's native land, and in all Europe. "Ghosts," which appeared later, was not looked on as immoral by the conscientious in Scandinavia. "A Doll's House" was. It was radicalism, and radicalism in Scandinavia is not a political theory; it applies to morals as well. Your English radical may be a devout Dissenter; your Scandinavian radical dissents, as a rule, from all laws that curb the development of the individual. Socialism is the negation of individuality; radicalism makes of it an apotheosis.

Ibsen has suffered much from the preeminence given to "A Doll's House," "Ghosts," "Hedda Gabler" and even "The Wild Duck." They were looked on as shocking. And they had a success of curiosity; but Ibsen was not, is not, the object of worship as he seems to be here in certain circles, and he has ceased to be the target for furious observers. He never pretended to teach; he became an investigator of the middle-class European society he knew. This diagnosis was of German Lutheran conventional society as well as of Scandinavian. If he protested against anything, it was against hypocrisy. And the contents of these comedies should not blind us to the wonderful theatrical skill and careful dramatic art they display. He is the greatest modern writer of dialogue; but that he should be taken seriously as a teacher of morals is as amazing to those who knew him, as it is to the people who gave him birth. It is regrettable, too, that a morbid curiosity should have blinded amateurs of literature to the beauty of "Brand" on which Ibsen's reputation in his native land largely rests, to the splendid poetry of "Peer Gynt." "Brand" was as violent a protest against the materialism of religious life in Norway as Wesleyism was against the self-complacency of the Anglicans of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth; and "Peer Gynt," a cutting satire on the faults of the Norwegian people, became a great poem with an appeal to the universal taste.

It ought not to be supposed for a moment that Lutheranism has not produced some good fruits in these Northern countries; Luther might have cut out more than he did. He built a "fester Burg" without a foundation, that is all. Dr. Grisar, in his preface to his excellent "Life of Luther" states this better than I can; but for official Lutheranism there can be no apology; and this has produced the state of society which Ibsen analyzed. That he should be looked on as a teacher of "advanced morals" is amazing; that he should be decried as an unskilled dramatist, and "Emperor or Galilean" and "Brand" forgotten, because his doubtful comedies of manners and morals created an excess of curiosity, is more amazing.

MAURICE FRANCIS EGAN.

REVIEWS

Beaumarchais and the War of American Independence. By ELIZABETH S. KITE. With a Foreword by James M. Beck. Two volumes. Illustrated. Boston: Richard G. Badger. \$5.00.

This is the interesting biography of a remarkable Frenchman of the eighteenth century whom Americans should know much more about than they do. As Mr. Beck in his foreword well observes: "Without depreciating the chivalrous services of the knightly Marquis [Lafayette] his contribution to the foundation of the American nation from a practical standpoint was less than that of Beaumarchais." "We must aid the Americans," he was constantly reminding the King and Court of France, and so fruitful was his zeal for the Revolution that he succeeded in shipping to America 200 pieces of cannon, 25,000 guns, 100 tons of powder

and equipment for 25,000 men, at a time when supplies were badly needed. Silas Deane indeed wrote to Congress in 1776 that the United States in his opinion was "in every account greatly indebted" to Beaumarchais "more so than to any other person on this side the water." The sum Beaumarchais demanded of Congress for services rendered was 3,600,000 *livres*. Little attention, however, was paid to his claims, but some years later Arthur Lee pretended to discover that Beaumarchais, far from being this country's creditor, actually owed us 1,800,000 francs. At last, in 1835, the United States gave the heirs of Beaumarchais 800,000 francs and the case was closed.

Miss Kite, who is a convert to the Faith, dwells largely, as is fitting, on the zeal for the American cause displayed by the subject of her biography, but she by no means neglects to give the reader an interesting account of Beaumarchais's varied gifts and checkered career. Born in 1732, the son of a Parisian watchmaker, he had so improved his fortunes that by 1761 he had secured a position at court that gave him a title of nobility. He subsequently became an expert in high finance, the author of two successful operas, was employed by the King as a secret-service agent in foreign countries, defended the rights of down-trodden playwrights, wrangled for years with corrupt judiciaries for the clearing of his character, took good care of all his relatives, managed to survive the Terror, and died in 1799. A famous wit and a man of fashion, he had many envious and vindictive enemies, but his unfailing good-nature and bold resourcefulness carried him safely through many a difficult and dangerous situation. The book's price is rather high but the author is devoting the profits she derives from the sale of the volume to war-work in France.

W. D.

War Verse. Edited by FRANK FOXCROFT. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company. \$1.25.

The compiler of this collection of "War Verse" tells us that since the present conflict began he has diligently read the British papers and reviews in quest of poetry on the war which in his opinion would be worth gathering into a book. The 300 pages of this volume hold the results of his labor. Most of the pieces selected only deserve to be called "War Verse" and hardly merit a place in an anthology. Nearly all the real poems in the volume, such as "The Spires of Oxford," "In Flanders' Fields" and "The Soldier," have already been quoted in these pages. Eric Chilman writes hopefully of "After-Days" thus:

When the last gun has long withheld
Its thunder, and its mouth is sealed,
Strong men shall drive the furrow straight
On some remembered battle-field.
Untroubled they shall hear the loud
And gusty driving of the rains,
And birds with immemorial voice
Sing as of old in leafy lanes.

The stricken, tainted soil shall be
Again a flowery paradise—
Pure with the memory of the dead
And purer for their sacrifice.

Laurence Binyon's appeal of "The Dead to the Living," which begins:

O you that still have rain and sun,
Kisses of children and of wife,
And the good earth to tread upon,
And the mere sweetness that is life,
Forget not us, who gave all these
For something dearer, and for you!

is another war poem that perhaps will live. Theodore Maynard's "Processional" it fittingly included in the collection; there is an admirable swing to all C. Fox Smith's verses; G. K. Chesterton's "The Wife of Flanders" and "Home at Last" can be found in

the volume, and these two simple stanzas by J. Napier Milne entitled "Laurel and Cypress" express a full heart's pride and grief:

I watched him swinging down the street,
The fairest lad in all the line,
His kilt and khaki, braw and neat,
My first-born—mine!

He sleeps beneath the blood-red sod—
A letter from the King to say:
"Fallen in Honor's Cause" . . . Thank God!
But ay! But ay!

W. D.

Appreciations and Depreciations. By ERNEST A. BOYD. **Anglo Irish Essays.** By JOHN EGLINTON. New York: John Lane Co. \$1.25 each.

The first of these two readable little volumes of essays seems to have missed, or at least ignored, an important point in the movement it attempts to describe. For "Ireland's Literary Renaissance" is composed of a double element, the Catholic and the Protestant, both that discussed at length in "Appreciations and Depreciations" and the other, championed by Pearse, Colum, and a host of other "mere Irish," as Mr. Boyd is pleased to style them. These two elements must not be confounded. Still, it is unfair to claim that the revival is peculiarly Protestant and that this element represents the character and spirit of Irish literature. The works of six representatives of Protestant Ireland's awakening, with their scarcely intelligible and even contradictory philosophies are subjected to thorough examination, the chapters on "AE" and "Lord Dunsany" being the most interesting. Admirers of the dangerous Bernard Shaw will doubtless find the two essays on their idol enlightening, but doubtful justice is done the late Edward Dowden. The writer of the essays himself evinces little more sound philosophical sense than those of his subjects who seem unable to bridge over properly the eternal gap between the ideal and the real.

The Anglo-Irishman or modern Irishman, according to John Eglinton, is "The Irishman . . . who accepts as a good European the connection with Great Britain and yet feels himself to be far more distinct from the Anglo-Saxon than he is from the 'mere Irishman.'" Skepticism, with its inevitable pessimistic outlook on life, dominates the "reasoning" powers of the author. As may be expected, this admirer of Nietzsche and of Swedenborg and his American pupil Emerson treats lightly the most evident truths of a sane philosophy and tends to plunge the reader into the depths of hopelessness. A certain literary charm attaches to the essays, reminding one of Emerson himself.

J. H. C.

Historical Records and Studies. THOMAS F. MEEHAN, STEPHEN FARRELLY, REV. JOSEPH F. DELANY, D. D., Editing Committee. Volume XII, June, 1918. New York: The United States Catholic Historical Society.

This latest volume of "Historical Records and Studies" offers the reader a very appetizing menu. Peter Condon, A. M., traces down to today the history of "The Church in the Island of San Domingo," William H. Bennet contributes a sketch of "Francis Cooper: New York's First Catholic Legislator," and Thomas F. Meehan of AMERICA's staff, records the deeds of American "Catholics in the War with Mexico." About two years ago the *American Freemason*, it may be remembered, revived the calumny that during the battle of Churubusco, the Americans lost 1,000 men owing to the obstinate resistance of more than 200 deserters from our army "composed mostly of Catholic Irish, who had been persuaded to desert at the instigation of the Mexican Catholic priests." Mr. Meehan proves by the documents he quotes that there is no reference to the deserters in question being of any particular religion. Indeed, according to statistics published at

the time fifty-four out of 112 members of the captured battalion of San Patricio were Americans, thirty-four of the rest being Irishmen. Another interesting paper is an account of the burning of the Charlestown convent, August 11, 1834, as told by John R. Buzzell, the leader of the Know-Nothing mob that committed the crime. The Rev. Walter F. Thornton, S.J., has translated from the Spanish the account written by Father John Riobo, O. S. F., of his voyage to "Alaska in 1779," and it is now published here. Henry Binsse contributes a charming sketch of Pierre Toussaint, a Catholic negro of Haiti, who was one of the pillars of St. Peter's Church, New York, in the middle of the last century. Mr. Binsse also tells in this number of "Historical Records and Studies" the story of "The Church of St. Vincent de Paul (the French Church), New York." An account of the last "General Meeting" and "Notes and Comments" complete this interesting volume.

W. D.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

"Karma, a Reincarnation Play" (Dutton, \$1.50), by Algernon Blackwood and Violet Pearn, is an exposition of an old dream, which the horrors of war have brought more vividly into current notice. The shadowy theme is treated with much dramatic power. —Every line that Joel Chandler Harris wrote on the Southern darkey is worth while, and lovers of this gentle, whole-souled writer will thank Mrs. Julia Collier Harris who edits, under the title "Uncle Remus Returns" (Houghton Mifflin, \$1.35), a number of stories contributed in 1905-1906 to the old *Metropolitan*. Eight illustrations by Frost and Condé add to the attractiveness of the volume.—"Tang of Life" (Houghton Mifflin, \$1.50), by Henry Herbert Knibbs, is a tale of the great Southwest. Mexico and Arizona are made the scenes of much action through dynamite and power. The adventures of Jim Waring, a professional gunman, are narrated in virile style with many exhilarating anecdotes. His son, Lorry, a youth of twenty, is a gentler character than his father, but he inherits from him the same ambition of ridding the land of I. W. W. gangs that rove about to the perturbation of all. A neat romance through the introduction of two Eastern ladies plays an interesting but quite secondary part.—Florence Olmstead's "On Furlough" (Scribner, \$1.50), is a rather dull story about two sets of lovers, one of whom is a British officer invalided to a little community in a southern State.

Mr. John Theodore Comes, A. A. I. A., M. S. A., the well-known Catholic architect, has published as a pamphlet the excellent lecture on "Catholic Art and Architecture," (published by the author, Renshaw Building, Pittsburgh, \$0.50) which he has delivered before the theological students of various seminaries. Realizing that the beauty of the churches that must be built in this country depends chiefly on the good taste of the parish priests of tomorrow, the author lays down solid principles for the seminarians' guidance, and admirably describes what a thing of beauty even the humblest Catholic church can be made. The pamphlet, which is finely illustrated with full-page pictures of new American churches, should by no means have its readers confined to seminarians. Every art lover should see it.

"A Life of Saint Francis Xavier, Based on Authentic Sources" (Herder, \$1.25), by M. T. Kelly; "Selected Letters of Saint Jane Frances de Chantal" (Kenedy, \$2), translated by the Sisters of the Visitation, Harrow, England, and "The True Apostolate" (Herder, \$1), which Father Girardey has translated and adapted from the French of Dom J. B. Chautard, the Abbot of Sept-Fons, a Trappist monastery, are three recent ascetical books that should have an appeal to various classes of Catholic readers. Miss Kelly has had access to the latest books and documents bearing on the Apostle of the Indies, and explodes several pious myths about him. Some readers may feel that the author has not

painted vividly enough the great soul of St. Francis, but has confined herself too closely to a chronological account of his career. Naturally Visitandines and their friends will feel the greatest interest in these letters of Mother de Chantal. There are more than a hundred of them and are written to her spiritual children, to St. Francis de Sales, and to lords and ladies not a few. In Dom Chautard's pages apostolic men and women will find many sage counsels regarding the importance of the interior life, for those who are engaged in works of zeal.

"The New Death" (Houghton Mifflin, \$1.25) a book by Winifred Kirkland which means nothing more than a dominant, living appreciation of death, is a materialist's arraignment of materialism. Common-sense, long dutifully rejected by would-be philosophers, is, theoretically at least, restored to a respected position. The doctrine of immortality and the existence of God are suggested as the great possibilities for present solace and future advancement. Despite the objective truth of her assertions, however, the manner in which the author derives and establishes them is far from satisfactory. She gropes her way to the powerful tenets of Christianity without an anchor of rational proof. Formerly a materialist, she now veers to Spiritism. She has too much guess and instinct; too little reason and belief. Her message is at one time pragmatic. "It does not matter whether or not the intuition is true. . . . What matters is the effect upon the emergent public life and private of the fact that every-day men and women are believing the dead live." At other times her message is evolutionary and pantheistic.

"Japan or Germany, the Inside Story of the Struggle in Siberia" (Doran, \$1.50) by Frederic Coleman is an interesting and timely book in view of the most recent turn in the tide of events in the Far East. Japan, Siberia, Vladivostok are the touch-wood for his pen. The author, a newspaper correspondent, writes with an ease and familiarity acquired from some years of intimacy with men and things in those parts. Of the twelve chapters that make up the volume, four are concerned with Japan, the underlying motive of her present policy, the views of her statesmen in the great struggle, while the rest treat of Siberia and the Revolution's influence upon it. To the question in the minds of many—why has not Japan entered more effectively into the present war by sending her troops to the battle fronts—Mr. Coleman gives an explanation which is illuminating and rather satisfying. Yet while the volume holds the reader's attention, the contents leave the impression more of disconnected essays thrown together to make a book, than of a well-worked-out development of a thesis. The author believes that Japan should go to Siberia with a group of sympathetic educators having "hearts in their breasts and hands of fellowship outstretched to the Russian in Siberia, but that she should not go merely to guard a pile of stores from the Huns."

EDUCATION

PHONETICS

AN urgent call comes for the "Americanization" of the immigrant. In many parts of our country the work has begun. Usually, the first essential step has been the teaching of English. Various methods have been employed, and their values considered. Some of the methods used and advocated by educators are the direct dramatic method, the objective method, the screen method, the Gouin method, the dictionary method, the phonetic method, and others. If a method other than the phonetic be chosen, the latter should be used in connection with it. It is of paramount importance, as it eliminates the difficulties

in pronunciation, which are always encountered in the study of a foreign language. By means of it we learn how we actually speak; we learn where and how each sound is formed, and it enables us to interpret the exact value of every vowel and consonant.

FORMATION OF SOUND

IF the immigrant is taught the proper formation of the English sounds, he will have no difficulty in producing them. This will prevent him from substituting similar sounds from his own language, which he is very apt to do. It is of utmost importance that the teacher should have a thorough knowledge of a good phonetic method, one employing characters to represent the sounds used in the English language. These characters are necessary to teach the specific sounds we use since we have no letters in the alphabet to represent them. Our pronunciation has changed, but we retain the old spelling which is no guide whatever in teaching modern spoken English. We write one language and speak another. The difference between the written form and the spoken form should be taught.

To begin with, monosyllables are generally marked in the dictionaries with the distinct sound of the vowel, as they are pronounced when uttered alone. But they so frequently occur unaccented, in reading and speaking, that they develop weak along with strong forms; the degree of weakness depending upon the style and rate of speech. The weak forms are uttered so as to give only an indistinct or obscure sound to the vowel. In the sentence, "How do you do?" it would be incorrect to pronounce the first "do" as strongly as the second. Such words as, "am, them, at, should, of, that, to, from," and many others, are generally used in their weak forms; strong forms are employed only for emphasis, and these words are seldom emphasized. In many words ending in "on," "en" and "el," the sound of "o" and "e" is suppressed.

PHONETIC TRANSCRIPTIONS

WEBSTER'S "New International Dictionary" states that "to pronounce words with their strong forms in such positions (as above indicated) either emphasizes them and thus gives them a special meaning, or makes the speech sound more or less abnormal, except in the very formal speech of formal occasions. To give a proper weakening to words normally so pronounced is dependent upon a natural instinct or cultivated feeling for the natural shades of sound in the language." Since the immigrant has not this natural instinct for the sounds of the English language, phonetic transcriptions are invaluable in teaching him these natural shades and sounds in reading and speaking. It is difficult to teach spoken English with our ordinary form of spelling, but with the phonetic characters it is comparatively a simple matter. A phonetic training will also enable the teacher to correct individual peculiarities and defects in utterance, as lisping, stammering and nasalizing. In a class of immigrants or children, practically all the speech peculiarities are caused by misplaced or wrongly formed sounds.

The phonetic method should also be used with the children in the classroom. They too should be taught the difference between the written and the spoken language. Well-meaning teachers often mistake for the height of refinement, a form of speech which is stiff and stilted and so obviously unnatural, and artificial, that it is merely ridiculous. They ignore the weak vowels in unaccented positions and instead give each syllable the strong form.

DIACRITICAL MARKS

ANOTHER defect found in the classrooms, is the neglect (or inability) to teach proper vowel sounds. The long "u" seems to be particularly ignored, as in "student, assume, new, knew, dew," etc. The intermediate "a" as in "ask, past,

last, bath," is commonly given the sound of "a" in "at"; if, however, we read the guide to pronunciation in Webster's or Worcester's, or other dictionaries, we find the preferred sound to be the "ah" sound. Likewise the "o" in "on, not, honor, doctor, body," etc.; the same diacritical mark placed over "long, song, wrong," is placed over the above words. Hence the same vowel sound should be given them. In regard to the short "o" in "on, not, honor, doctor, body," etc., Webster's dictionary, in the guide to pronunciation says, "a certain faulty pronunciation of this vowel is changing it to "ah" in "ask." If we would familiarize ourselves with a good phonetic method, we would not misinterpret sounds, since each character represents one sound, and represents that same sound in all languages. Fortunately there are many good phonetic books published, as well as a phonetic pronouncing dictionary.

We find many who are unable to interpret the diacritical marks in the dictionary. This is not surprising, because there are so many marks with a slight shade of difference, and no letter in the alphabet portrays the exact sound. The respelling, for the pronunciation, found in the dictionary is a great help, but evidently not sufficient, or there would not be so much misinterpretation of the diacritical marks. For this reason a simpler and more accurate method to guide our pronunciation is necessary. Any child after learning the phonetic characters, which can be done in a few hours, can interpret the exact sound the author or lexicographer advocates in the use of a word or in the construction of a sentence, and this is more than most can do with the regular dictionary, even after they are grown up. As Worcester says, "This is not intended to introduce any new sounds, but merely to discriminate such as are now heard, from all who speak the language with propriety."

A. E. WOLTER.

SOCIOLOGY

A Wise Man's Dream

IT was an ancient mariner that stopped England's future Chancellor and Martyr one fair morning in Flanders, and held him with his glittering eye and the fascination of his strange story. In company with his friend, Cuthbert Tunstall, Thomas More had gone to Flanders on the business of his royal master, Henry VIII. At Antwerp he had met Peter Giles, the friend of Erasmus. One morning after Divine service in Our Lady's Church he saw Giles in earnest talk with a stranger, "a man well stricken in age, with a black sun-burned face, a long beard and a cloak cast homely about his shoulders," whom by his favor and apparel he forthwith judged to be a mariner. The fascinating stranger was Raphael Hythloday, "Portugal-born," a much-traveled Ulysses, something of a Munchausen, familiar with the cities, the ways and manners of men. According to his own story, Hythloday had sailed the seas with "Amerike Vespuce," and had been his constant companion. But from his last voyage he had not immediately returned to his native land, for he had been one of the twenty-four companions of the great navigator left behind in the "land of Gulicke." From that place he had wandered to "Taprobane" and "Caliquit," and thence had traveled back to his own country. In the course of his many travels he had gone to a hitherto uncharted island, and there lived among a strange people, subject to a constitution wholly different from anything he had either dreamt of or seen. The island was called Utopia, the Isle of Nowhere.

UTOPIA

RAPHAEL HYTHLODAY, like "Utopia" itself, is a figment of the mind of the witty Englishman. The book in which More told of the imaginary adventures of his hero and collected

his observations on the constitution of the island may be looked upon as one of the first fiction books of the English language. It is true that it is neither romance, nor novel, nor story strictly so-called. It falls into the class of those "dream-books" of the wise men of various generations who build political, social and religious castles in cloudland, on the airy foundations of imagination and fancy. Yet it often happens that it is to these unsubstantial foundations that the practical men of succeeding ages go to quarry the stones of the edifice they build. The "Utopia" thus deserves a place besides the "Republic" of Plato, the "New Atlantis" of Francis Bacon, Campanella's "City of the Sun," the "Oceana" of Harrington, the "Mundus Alter et Idem" of Hall. The list of such books is a large one, and embraces a wide variety both of authors and views, as may be seen in Cyrano de Bergerac's account of the "States and Empires of the Moon," in the "Leviathan" of Hobbes, Goodwin's "Man in the Moon," Bellamy's "Looking Backward," Butler's "Erewhon" (Nowhere), Swift's "Gulliver's Travels," Filmer's "Patriarcha" and Lytton's "Coming Race."

Because Sir Thomas More sealed a noble life with a martyr's death, we need not approve of all the views he sets forth in the "Utopia." There can be little doubt that sometimes he writes just to make his merry jest at the expense of the society in which he lived. He records and sets down certain manners and polities, not because he really approves of them, but because he knows well that the men of his own times will rub their eyes as they read them, because they are so different from their own, and, just a little also, because they will shock them. The Chancellor always enjoyed his little jest and loved to mystify his hearers. He mystified some, at least, of his contemporaries with his "Utopia," for zealous men like Budaeus and Paludanus, after reading the book, were minded to send out missionaries to the "Utopians," thinking it a pity that such naturally goodly folk should perish without the light of the Gospel and the blessings of Christianity. More must have stroked his beard and smiled, and thought, perhaps, that it were better if these sage philosophers began the work of conversion somewhat nearer home. The mystification extended even further, for in our own times William Morris thought he found in the book a justification of his Social theories, while the pious and learned Cardinal Zigiara thought it should be placed on the Index.

TRANSLATED FROM THE LATIN

THE "Utopia" is undoubtedly a strange book. Ralph Robinson "Englished" it from the original Latin in 1551, and the translation in some ways deserves to be ranked with Florio's "Montaigne," or those Lives of Plutarch which Sir Thomas North put into racy and vigorous Elizabethan, not directly from the Greek, but from the quaint French of good Bishop Amyot. It will be startling also to the general reader, as he realizes that one of the first bits of fiction in our language should deal, not so much with man and the individual, as with society, and that it should deal with many of the very complicated problems which are troubling and vexing us today. In this respect the book is quite modern. Though it reflects the age of the Tudors, it appeals strongly to the man of the present age. In this sense it is quite up to date, and the romance of "Nowhere" should thus get a welcome everywhere; "Utopia" is thus definitely circumscribed and localized. Besides this, it has its peculiar literary flavor, for as its first translator, Ralph Robinson, said in 1551, "He that readeth it doubtless he shall take great pleasure and delite both in ye sweete eloquence of ye writer, and also in ye witte, invencion, and fine conveiaunce or disposition of ye matter: but most of all in ye goode and holesome lessons which be there in great plenty and abundance."

Utopia indeed is a wonderful island. It is 500 miles long and 200 miles at its widest. Its polity is that of a confederation of free City-States. There are forty-four of these on the

island. They are relatively large, each containing 6,000 families, and all solidly built. Each city is surrounded by twenty miles of rich agricultural territory which the inhabitants are supposed to work and till. Every year each of these City-States sends three of its wisest senators to Amaurote, the City of Shadows, the capital of Nowhere.

THE CITY OF SHADOWS

THE country outside of the towns was mainly agricultural. The State furnished the implements of labor, and, after certain periods, the rural population was shifted to the cities, while the city folk were sent to the fields to take a turn at the plough and the scythe. On the banks of the Anyder, the waterless river, stood the City of Shadows, Amaurote. It was protected by high walls. The dwellings were all of one pattern. The streets looked as if they were composed of but one house, a convenient, but certainly not an artistic, arrangement. Householders had no permanent proprietary rights in their homes, for every ten years they changed houses by drawing lots. The Utopians believed in a community of goods. Money they despised and used only to pay their mercenaries and in their trade with foreign countries. For though they were trained to martial exercises, they preferred to have others do the fighting for them. Gold they had in plenty, but to show the vanity of artificial wealth they used the simplest things for themselves, dressed simply in garments of leather or skin that lasted seven years and all made on the same pattern. They must have been dreadful to behold. To show their contempt for gold and silver, they forged gold and silver fetters for their slaves, and when they wished to degrade and shame a man, they placed a crown of gold upon his head and gyves of gold upon his feet and hands. Millions today would gladly submit to such gilded slavery.

In religious matters the Utopians were extremely tolerant. The boasted tolerance of our days More had forestalled. According to him, old King Utopus, the original founder of the commonwealth, had made a law that every man might be of the religion of his own choosing, and might endeavor to bring others to his mode of thinking by fair argument, but without bitterness against those of other opinions. No one was to use reproaches or violence to force his own religion on his fellow-citizens. Those who violated this law were condemned to banishment or slavery. But this toleration did not extend to those who were atheists or denied the immortality of the soul. Utopus and his Utopians had rightly concluded that such persons were a danger to the State, and "scarce worthy to be accounted men." Those who denied the immortality of the soul "degraded so noble a being as the soul and reckoned it no better than a beast." Such men were not to be accounted fit members of the commonwealth, for, logically, they must needs despise all laws and customs, for one who is afraid of nothing but the laws, and looks to annihilation after death, will not scruple to violate those laws, either by fraud or force, when by doing so he may satisfy his passions. Such men were not punished, for, according to old Utopus, men cannot force themselves to believe what they please, yet, because on such an important point their views were distorted, they were not to be lifted to any post of honor or prominence in the country. We have progressed in the matter of religious tolerance since More's time. It would be interesting to know what he would now think of our large-mindedness.

MORE AHEAD OF HIS TIME

ON many points More was ahead of his times, perhaps too much ahead of our own, too, as may be seen in his "Utopian," and rather startling and dangerous theories about "eugenic marriages." But on such live topics as predatory wealth, penology, secret diplomacy, hospital equipment and

work, there is a modern note which must astonish the reader.

The "Utopia" is not much read today. But it deserves a perusal. In an age so keenly interested in the problems of government and social work, while some of its theories and customs were evidently meant to be pure fiction, many others will afford ample matter for study and thought. One noble idea stands out in splendid relief from the statesman-martyr's masterpiece. According to him, man must ever struggle forward through trials and dangers on the road of true progress and civilization. He must do so by stifling in his heart the ignoble impulses of a callous egoism. He must remember that he is the member of a great social body, a larger family. That larger body must provide within its sphere for his comfort, peace and happiness. He in his turn cannot forget that he has important and imperative duties towards it. For the peace, happiness and general welfare of others he must forget himself. The "Utopia" is a dream. As in a dream, fantastic visions flit before us. But dim forms also are seen, clothed in the garb of reality. A strange and, at times, incongruous dream came to the great Chancellor. On many things he firmly grasped the reality and the truth, and gave the world an excellent study in sociology.

JOHN C. REVILLE, S. J.

NOTE AND COMMENT

Aims of the National Catholic War Council

FOR the purpose of assisting the Catholic body in its cooperation with the Government a "Handbook of the National Catholic War Council" has been published by the Administrative Committee of Bishops. It is both historical and directive, describing the origin and development of our Catholic war activities and outlining the program for a perfect and efficient cooperation with all the various Government agencies. Nothing better calculated to unify our efforts and coordinate them with the work of every other national organization has hitherto been accomplished:

The tasks which face the Church in America are countless. Problems are arising from day to day which demand prompt solutions and those solutions can be given with foresight and directness through a national body only, gathered from every part of the United States for the purpose of establishing the cooperative intelligence necessary for such decision. Everything must be looked at from a national standpoint. The National Catholic War Council, therefore, aims frankly towards the amalgamation of all Catholic activities in such a way that the Church will be enabled to meet the historic responsibilities that now rest upon her.

It is the desire of the National War Council to bring its message of patriotic service into every Catholic home, and for this end it looks especially to the parish units for a perfect cooperation with its aims and methods, since the parish is regarded by it as the supreme testing place of the length and breadth and depth of Catholic patriotism. The Handbook accordingly suggests the war activities which should be carried on within the boundary of each parish, modified by local conditions. Not only are war problems to be considered by the National War Council, but it would likewise offer a national cooperation to the civic, social, moral and religious agencies at work in the United States. No corporate body, as it is rightly said, can be so easily adjusted along national lines as the Catholic Church, and the same holds true of the international service which we shall be called upon to render, now that America has passed from its "splendid isolation" into intimate relation with all the world. "The world is no longer divided into little circles of interest. The world no longer consists of neighborhoods," as President Wilson proclaimed in stirring words, "The world is linked in a common life and interest such as humanity never saw before." Here,

therefore, is a glorious mission for the Church, in which the National Catholic War Council itself should form but one link in the chain of Catholic activities.

Kaiserism Rampant in Florida

UNDER the heading, "Kaiserism Rampant," the *Miami Herald* has the following enlightened editorial upon the latest attempt of Sidney J. Catts to enthronize religious bigotry on the governmental chair of Florida:

In view of such statements as these from the declaration of rights in the constitution of the State of Florida, it is difficult to see how an executive of the State can attempt to discriminate against any person on account of his religious belief. The constitution says: "All men are equal before the law." "The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship shall forever be allowed in this State." "No preference shall be given by law to any church, sect or mode of worship." The legislature has never yet attempted to violate the spirit of these statements in the bill of rights by passing a law excluding from the teaching force of the State those belonging to any particular religious organization.

It is said, however, that the Governor has recently warned the superintendent of public instruction of Pasco county that if the board of public instruction of that county makes a contract with a Catholic teacher, "I shall hold it to your charge and to the charge of the county commissioners or school trustees of your county."

The Governor bases his action on the ground that he made his campaign and was elected on the platform that no Catholic should be employed as a teacher in the public schools of Florida. This, in the face of his oft-repeated statement that he was elected on the Prohibition platform. In other words, the Governor, by the threat of removal of certain officers, proposes to make a law for himself and enforce it, which is contrary to the letter and the spirit of the constitution and is without warrant from the legislature. The Executive seems to think that he is above and beyond the law and that he can make statutes binding upon the people, of his own will. That is the rankest kind of Kaiserism, a system we are fighting to destroy. For bigotry and pure assumption of power the Kaiser has furnished us no more glittering example, at any time.

There is obviously a Hindenburg line of religious intolerance that must still be broken in America itself before the world can be made entirely safe for democracy.

American Press Tributes to Archbishop Ireland

"FEW American citizens throughout the 142 years which have elapsed since the signing of the Declaration of Independence," says the *New York Herald*, "have earned the respect, esteem and love of as many people as has John Ireland, Archbishop of the diocese of St. Paul." Greater tribute than this could hardly be paid to any man as a citizen and patriot. Similar enthusiasm was displayed by other great daily papers. We quote in part from an editorial that appeared in the *Times* of New York:

Another great figure of the Church, a great figure of American life for two generations, is gone. When the young priest, John Ireland, went to Minnesota it was a community, to the Eastern imagination at least, of pioneers and Indians. He lived to see it prosperous and populous, advanced in education, in charity and the arts of civilization, with famous cities whose growth almost from a village he had watched. He had an active part in all that growth and construction. There was no worthy cause which he did not serve. And if the cathedral of St. Paul is often spoken of as his monument, there are other and far-spread memorials, material and immaterial, of his long career.

The young chaplain of the Fifth Minnesota, who tossed cartridges into the soldiers' haversacks when they were short

of ammunition, was always an eager and ardent patriot. A man of salient and impressive personality, he had strong opinions, and he was not afraid to express them when he thought the well-being of the United States was threatened. His vigorous common-sense was impatient of the silver dreams of Mr. Bryan, and he smote the 16 to 1 delusion with no sparing hand. A great friend of Mr. Roosevelt, he denounced the initiative, the referendum, and the recall, especially the judicial recall: "Let us pray the God of nations that there be no sacrilegious hand laid upon the courts, impairing their independence or lowering their majesty."

He was a Republican. It was through him that Mr. Taft was enabled to arrive at his settlement of the thorny question of the friars' lands in the Philippines. It was sometimes said by those who disagreed with him in politics, or whose toes he had trodden on otherwise, that Archbishop Ireland was too much of a politician. He was a politician, so far as he was one, because he was a good and wise and patriotic American.

The writer then alludes to the undimmed fire of the great Archbishop's patriotism when on the verge of his eightieth year he addressed the Minnesota naval recruits: "The man should not live," he told them, "who does not love and cherish his country." There was no one who loved and cherished it more than the great Catholic churchman whose death the entire nation mourns.

Bishop Candler on Unity

BISHOP WARREN A. CANDLER of the Methodist Episcopal Church South is somewhat exercised over the growing desire of sincere Protestants to put an end to denominational differences. The result of the episcopal emotion is an interesting, if amusing, article in a recent number of the *Atlanta Journal*, wherein Mr. Candler makes a drive against a "generalissimo" for Protestantism. In the exuberance of his argument he insinuates that there is an essential difference between the sects and feels that reconciliation is quite impossible, even though God, omniscient and omnipotent, be the head and front of the Protestant religions. This is hardly a worthy tribute either to God or to Protestants, and, moreover, it ill becomes the pen or lips of a bishop who is so familiar with the Person and policy of Our Lord that he knows for sure that "He will not have a vice-regent to represent Him, for He is not so excluded from His own world that He must handle it at second-hand." If it were permissible to fall into the bishop's style, it would be pertinent to remark that it would be interesting to know what God thinks of Mr. Candler's statement. Most people will be inclined to feel that He would refuse to acknowledge authorship or sanction of the flat contradictions concerning faith and morals prevalent in the sects. On the contrary, all reasonable folk will conclude that Our Lord would cite the prevalent chaos as an argument in favor of a Divinely assisted "generalissimo" whose most important function would be to define and preserve the doctrines for which Christ died. It is inconceivable that Our Lord should have proclaimed certain doctrines necessary for salvation, have died in testimony of them, and yet not have established an absolutely sure medium for their preservation and transmission to man, whose eternal salvation depends on ready acceptance and practice of the Word. Such a policy would argue either the impotence of omnipotence or the stupidity of omniscience, or both. And under these circumstances the sectaries could proclaim that Christ is God and Christ is not God, that hell exists and hell does not exist, etc., without reproach. God only would be the reproach. Amusingly enough, the bishop gives his whole case away by admitting that Christ demanded among all people "that spiritual unity which subsists between the Father and Son." Surely the Father and Son are not divided over doctrinal points, as is Protestantism. Moreover, the logical and even necessary outcome of "that spiritual unity which subsists between Father and Son" is unity of organization, the one fold and the one

shepherd that Christ desired. This, too, is the lesson of Scripture. To Mr. Candler this is Teutonism, but the Allies will no doubt feel that the bishop holds the frantic Kaiser and the mephitic Crown Prince in too high regard.

On the Trail of the
"Yellow Dog"

THE Brothers of St. Mary's College, Oakland, recently sought to raise a fund for the rebuilding of their college structure, which had been swept by the flames a few months ago. Slips of paper, called "bricks," were sold to the citizens of the local communities with the express approval of the Red Cross, the W. S. S. Committee, the Y. M. C. A. and the Chambers of Commerce of Oakland, Berkeley and Alameda, as well as of the Knights of Columbus and the Catholic Federation. To counteract the good thus accomplished the following anonymous circular was placed under the doors of thousands of Oakland homes:

A MESSAGE
TO THE PROTESTANT PEOPLE OF OAKLAND

Don't buy any bricks! but save your dimes and dollars for the Red Cross and our boys in the trenches.

What interest have you in an institution conducted by those who condemn the American Public School system? Listen to this!

"Let the public school system go to where it came from—the Devil."—*Freeman's Journal*, November 20, 1869.

"Education outside of the Catholic Church is a damnable heresy."—*Syllabus of Pope Pius IX*, issued in 1864, Articles 45, 46, 47, 48.

"The State has no right to educate, and when the State undertakes the work of education it is usurping the power of the church."—Bishop McQuade, in a lecture in Boston, February 13, 1876.

"Education must be controlled by Catholic authorities, and under education the opinions of the individuals and utterances of the press are included, and many opinions are to be forbidden by the secular arm, under the authority of the Church, quoted by *Catholic World*, July, 1870.

Why should you, a Protestant, and a patriotic American citizen, support such an institution?

Don't destroy this, but pass it on to some other Protestant. Nuff ced.

In exposing this libel the editor of the *Oakland Post* wrote:

Over the bloody fields of France today more than 100 former students of St. Mary's College, in Oakland, are marching behind the Stars and Stripes in the drive against the Huns, so that democracy may survive and human liberty may be preserved. The service flag of the college has 503 stars in it and *three of them are in gold*. But while more than 100 former students are known to be facing the guns of the enemy in the present crucial battle, their Alma Mater is being viciously attacked in Oakland by pro-German agitators. These enemies of democracy and liberty are too cowardly to fight in the open, so they resort to the despicable means of an anonymous letter.

Naturally the pro-Germans who hoped to cause dissension among Americans here with this circular went back to dates nearly fifty years ago, believing they would not be checked. The publications and dates *have been checked*, however, with the result that the statements in the circular were found to be false.

The anonymous circular, attacking St. Mary's College, is in violation of the spirit, if not the letter, of the espionage act, and therefore it is presumed that secret service agents of the United States Government will take charge of the case. The circular was intended to cause discord at a time when it is imperative that true American citizens present a unified front to the foe, casting aside petty prejudices and small differences of opinion as they devote their energies and resources to the sole purpose of saving civilization. The very essence of democracy is the freedom to worship God according to one's own conscience. Many of the founders of this Republic left their homes in Europe and braved the hardships of the wilderness to enjoy this freedom. But while St. Mary's men are shedding their blood on the soil of France today, so that no man or clique of men shall have the power to shape the lives of other people, a blow is struck at the very foundation of democracy at home.

In fine the editor offers a reward of six War Saving Stamps to the first boy who will establish the identity of the "yellow dog" responsible for this act of cowardice and malice.

The Pope and the
Prussians

A FEW days since there appeared in the *North American Review's War Weekly* this eloquent editorial, under the caption of "The Hun and the Pope":

Of course one Hun lie more or less does not matter, and most Hun lies are so transparent that they carry their own refutation on their own brazen, imbecile faces. Yet now and then one crops up rather persistently and perhaps succeeds in leaving its poison behind it here and there.

Such an one is that to the effect that the Pope is pro-Hun in his sympathies. Religious bigotry is the soil in which this particular falsehood best flourishes, of course, and in that soil, both in this country and in England, it has been most assiduously cultivated. It is Hun propaganda pure and simple. There are several objectives sufficiently visible. One is to sow religious dissension in Allied countries. Another is an attempt to throw the mantle of the Church of Rome's highest dignitary over the unspeakable bestialities which have loaded the Huns with infamy and made the very name of Germany a stench to the nostrils among civilized nations for generations to come. Still another, but to the Hun mind an unconscious result, would be to make the Supreme Pontiff in some measure share this burden of obloquy.

Like most Hun lies it is false on its face and false of record. Pope Benedict XV neither by word nor deed since the war began has shown the slightest sympathy with the Hun or the Hun's piratical purposes. On the contrary, he has denounced Hun barbarities as no other neutral has ventured to denounce them. He was the one and only neutral of great or restricted world influence in official utterance to denounce the infamy of Belgium's invasion. While this Government of ours stood in the acquiescence of silence before that black outrage, the Pope of Rome protested in words of withering reproof against it. Likewise he denounced the unnameable Hun brutalities in Belgium, while our own and other then neutral Governments stood officially mute. The Pope denounced the bombing of open cities and towns. He denounced the murderous, piratical use the Hun made of the submarine. He denounced to the verge of bitterness the deportation and enslavement under Hun masters of the Belgian population. The plain fact of the matter is, in view of our own Government's official attitude while the hideous scroll of Hun horrors was being unrolled in the early days of the war, that an American cuts a pretty sorry figure before the world when he chirps his parrot echo of the Hun propaganda lie that the Pope is pro-Hun.

But it will not go far, that particular piece of Potsdam mendacity. It will not reach to, much less survive, the end of the war. By no means not the least of the by-product blessings which the war already has brought, and every day is bringing in greater effectiveness, is the expansion of religious tolerance and the restriction of religious prejudice among the peoples of the civilized world. Indeed there is promise of the dawn of an era of tolerance in this respect among mankind such as the world has never known in all its stormy, bloody history of religious differences and dissensions. Our own country and our own army and navy are striking exemplars of the fact. The Young Men's Christian Association and the National Catholic War Council, the Salvation Army, the Catholic Knights of Columbus, the Jewish Welfare Board, the War Camp Community Service—all sorts and shades of religious belief and non-belief are standing shoulder to shoulder in the one common cause and with the one common purpose of making the world a fit place for law-abiding, kindly-disposed, peace-loving men and nations to live in.

Surely that is a beautiful spectacle, one which every Christian of whatever shade or division or sub-division of faith, every clean-hearted, right-thinking man of whatever nation or creed, may well rejoice to behold—rejoice in its present significance and rejoice still more in the promise its post-bellum continuance so alluringly holds out to us of a kindlier, a gentler and a vastly better Hun-delivered world in the days to come.

Comment would but quench the fire of this masterpiece.

